The Forum

APRIL, 1897.

HAS THE SENATE DEGENERATED?

It cannot be doubted that there is a widespread and growing impatience with the condition of things in the Senate. Indeed, it is becoming something more than impatience. It has already become distrust; and I am afraid we shall soon be compelled to say—condemnation. This feeling seems to be growing among the men who, if the Senate be what the framers of the Constitution meant and hoped, should be its strongest support.

It will not do to say that the most passionate utterances of this feeling come from what we should term the populace, were we speaking of other countries. Fortunate in so many other things, our country, if it have a populace at all,—and a populace is a very different thing from a people,—is especially fortunate in the character and quality of this usually undesirable element of a state. Elsewhere this eager, frantic, excitable, headstrong element of society burns dwellings and warehouses, collects in mobs, hangs from lamp-posts those who are obnoxious to it. It is made up of what are called the lower classes,—the poor and ignorant, half-starved women, workmen out of employ, ruffians and criminals. Here, with some very few exceptions in the large cities, there is little disposition to revolution or to turbulence. Our poorer and illiterate classes are orderly, quiet, and submissive. They have pretty decided political opinions; and they are constant to their political objects. The few mobs we have had of late years have grown out of the contests between organized labor and organized capital, and have been conducted under circumstances which in other

Copyright, 1896, by The Forum Publishing Company.
Permission to re-publish articles is reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries would have meant revolution, or a large destruction of property and the overthrow of social order. Our populace does not come from the poor or ignorant classes. It is made of very different material. It has white and clean hands. It parts its hair in the middle. It often understands foreign languages, sometimes Latin and Greek. It has a cultivated taste in matters of art. It has sometimes a professor of art among its numbers, although it has never done much to stimulate a virile sentiment as to painting, sculpture, or architecture. It is polished by foreign travel. It lives on its income. It expresses its indignation in excellent English in magazine articles, in orations before literary societies, or at the Commencements of schools for young ladies. It takes the facts of current history, on which it bases its judgments, without original investigation, from the hasty reports of careless correspondents, or the columns of some favorite newspaper. It prates and chatters a good deal about the sentiment of honor and political purity; but it is never found doing any strenuous work on the honest side when these things are in peril. It never helps us by an argument; although it has settled for itself, and would like to settle for us without either study or experience, the subtle questions of free trade, of protection, of fiscal mechanism, and of political economy. It contributes to public discussions nothing but sneers, or expressions of contempt or pessimistic despair. It is found quite as commonly on the wicked side as on the honest side. It is never troubled by election frauds, nor by the corruption of the elective franchise, if only thereby its purposes may be accomplished, or the men to whom it takes a fancy may be elevated to power. It has harassed and hampered the bravest champions of righteousness when they were engaged in their death struggles. It judges everything that is excellent by its defects, and accepts nearly everything that is base at its pretences. It has concluded that this country of ours is not worth living in; and its highest ambition is to cultivate foreign friendships and to spend abroad as much of its time as possible.

This cultivated and lettered populace of ours is not to be taken too seriously. Still less is it to be for an instant confounded with the company of admirable, simple-hearted, great-hearted, wise, and faithful scholars and teachers—the Mark Hopkinses, the Woolseys, the Peabodys, the Thatchers, the Whitneys, the James Walkers, the Parks, the Francis Walkers, the Julius Seeleys, who have adorned our great universities and colleges, and to whom thousands and thousands of our leading men in public life have owed what is best in their training

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and character. All honor and praise and gratitude to the great teachers who have turned many to righteousness and who shine as the brightness of the firmament and as the stars forever and ever!

But, as I have said, let us not take our cultured and lettered populace too seriously. Above all let us not fail to take to ourselves whatever lesson it can teach us. While its reflections are not very profound or original, yet for that very reason it may be the more likely to repeat what other and wiser men are thinking.

It is best to look this thing squarely in the face. Let us see what the Senate itself can do and what the people can do to amend what is matter for just complaint, and to defend and explain matters of which there is unjust complaint. How much that we suffer or think we suffer is incident to all government? How much is incident to all popular government? How much is the necessary and cheap price which we pay for the peerless blessings of Union and Liberty? How much of the evil we have seen within the last few years has been cured, and how much is in the process of cure? What proposals of reform seem wise, and what seem unwise? Above all, what of the matters complained of are from mistakes, faults, or evil qualities for which the Senate is responsible, and what from mistakes, faults, or evil qualities for which the people are responsible, and which would as surely exist if the will and purpose of the people had found expression in the way most direct and prompt consistent with constitutional freedom?

We must admit that in recent years there have been important cases in which the Senate, through obstructions to the will of the majority, which are possible under its rules, has failed in its duty to enact measures which the people desired, and which a majority of its own membership favored. What is called filibustering, that is, making dilatory motions and occupying by them the time which ought to be given to business, has been occasionally, though not frequently, resorted to. Probably this has not happened once in the Senate where it has happened twenty times in the House of Representatives, or in some of our State legislatures. But it is still possible; and it is a great evil. It is likewise true that the desire of the people and the will of the Senate itself have been frequently baffled by using the power of lawful and constitutional debate, not for the purpose of discussing practical questions which are expected to be brought to an issue, but for consuming time so as to prevent action. Senators who have great measures in their charge are compelled to sit in vexed and angry impatience while other Senators pour out an endless stream of inane and empty chatter,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chatter, chatter, about matters which have no present practical importance whatever. I use the plural—Senators. I am somewhat doubtful whether I should do that. Certainly the men who have ever done so can be counted on the fingers of one hand. We are often compelled, also, to refrain from even defending or advocating important and valuable measures, and to leave them to make their way, without explanation, against attack and objection. Important salutary bills have often been beaten by able and sensible speeches in their favor, because so much time has been consumed, even in brief and needful debate, that the vote has not been reached.

Now, in answer to these complaints, it is not enough to say what I shall presently say, that it is essential to have in at least one of our legislative bodies opportunity for free speech, for full debate, and for unlimited amendment. It is certainly essential that full discussion and consultation should exist in the Supreme Court. Yet, if four judges out of nine undertook to prevent the entry of judgment in a case involving a great constitutional question, by endless discussion, by reading extracts from law treatises or from the Revised Statutes, by eternal talking about little cases so that great ones could not be reached, —if such a supposition may be made in regard to that august tribunal,—I think we could find some way to put an end to the nuisance, and perhaps the official head of the offender would be very quickly detached by the salutary process of impeachment.

The Senate has the powers of free speech and free amendment. Important as they are to the Senate, they are only important to promote and secure the best exercise of its power and duty to enact wholesome and necessary laws. The mechanism to accomplish the object ought not to be used to defeat the object itself. This evil is but the manifestation in the Senate of a pestilent and prevalent evil which is showing itself elsewhere in many parts of the country. It is the attempt by minorities to prevent the constitutional action of majorities whenever the minority happen not to like it. The worst form of it is the election frauds which have prevailed over a great part of the country, and which are viewed with indifference, and even with satisfaction, by some persons who are most earnest in their condemnation of filibustering in the Senate. They look with great complacency on processes like those by which the constitutional right of suffrage of the colored man was extinguished in Alabama, and, afterward, the constitutional right of the white was extinguished in the same State. This is not disagreeable to them, so long as the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

senatorial power acquired by the process is used to defeat a protective tariff. But when it happens to be used to defeat an arbitration treaty, or a bankruptcy bill, or to promote the free coinage of silver, they discover their mistake. But I agree that it makes no difference whether they have been mistaken or to blame. It is our duty to recognize the evil and to cure it, whoever may have been to blame for it.

This is but a manifestation in the Senate of the same treasonable spirit which has led men to interfere with the organization of State legislatures for the mere purpose of defeating the election of Senators with whom the men who are guilty do not agree in political opinion, or of men who stand in the way of the personal ambitions of aspirants for the place. This has happened in some recent most humiliating instances,—notably in the State of Oregon.

I think a practical cure can be found for both these evils, if only we can have the support of an aroused, wise, well-instructed public sentiment. The cure will not be found in intemperate reviling of the Senate, nor in passionate expressions of despair for the Republic.

First. We ought to have laws upon the statute-book, both national and State, punishing by sufficient penalties every Senator or Representative who absents himself from the body to which he belongs, for the purpose of preventing the exercise of its constitutional functions, and declaring that such absences shall operate as a resignation of the seat. The failure of a Senator or Representative-elect to qualify, should be punished in the same way; such failure being declared a refusal to accept the office. This can be done without any amendment of either national or State Constitution.

Second. I believe a rule can be, indeed it has been, devised which will secure reasonable opportunity to vote in the Senate and at the same time secure reasonable debate and reasonable amendment.

When these two things are accomplished, we shall have done everything we can to cure the evil until we shall elevate and purify the character of the people itself. The stream will not rise higher than its source. Our great legislative bodies will represent always what is evil and what is good in the popular character. Wherever universal suffrage exists, the tares and the wheat will be gathered into the same bundle. Other generations will have their faults; and those faults will be manifested in the two Houses of Congress. But we have virtue and intelligence enough to cure ourselves, if we will but keep sober and not yield to either unreasoning anger or weak despair.

Now, having admitted the truth of so much that is said in condem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nation of the Senate, let me state some things that ought to be said in its favor.

The Senate, when Washington delivered his first Inaugural, had twenty-two members. It will begin the twentieth century with ninety. It is likely that before many years five more States, formed from our present territory, will bring up the number to a hundred. If—which Heaven avert!—there shall be additions from the continent on the South, or from the islands of the sea, they must come in and take their equal share in our self-government, and the number will be still further increased. Neither our institutions nor the temper of our people are adapted to the government of dependencies. We wish for no vassal states, nor subject citizens.

This increase of its numbers, if there were no other reason, makes it interesting to examine anew the original constitution of the Senate, and to see how far it has met the expectations of the Fathers, and whether any changes may profitably be made.

It is proposed to take the appointment of Senators from the legislatures and have them elected by the people. This is the first change in the structure of the Constitution that has been seriously proposed. The other amendments have been either to secure personal rights, to limit national or State legislation, or (in a single instance) to provide a better method of action by the electoral colleges in choosing the President.

Such a method of election would essentially change the character of the Senate as conceived by the Convention that framed the Constitution and the people who adopted it.

Practically it would transfer the selection of the members of this body from the legislatures, which are entrusted with all the legislative powers of the States, to conventions,—bodies having no other duties, whose election cannot be regulated by law, whose members act by proxy, whose tenure of office is for a single day, whose votes and proceedings are not recorded, who act under no personal responsibility, whose mistakes, ordinarily, can be corrected only by bolting and choosing Senators who do not represent the opinions concerning public measures and policies of the men who choose them.

It requires the substitution of pluralities for majorities in the election.

It will create new temptations to fraud, corruption, and other illegal practices, and in close cases will give rise to numerous election contests which must tend seriously to weaken confidence in the Senate.

It will absolve the larger States from the constitutional obligation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which secures the equal representation of all the States in the Senate by providing that no State shall be deprived of that equality without its consent.

It implies, what the whole current of our history shows to be untrue, that during the past century the Senate has failed to meet the just expectations of the people, and that the State legislatures have proved themselves unfit to be the depositaries of the power of electing Senators.

The reasons which require this change, if acted upon and carried to their logical result, will lead to the election by the direct popular vote, and by popular majorities, of the President and of the Judiciary, and will compel the placing of these elections under complete national control. It will result in the overthrow of the whole scheme of the Senate and, in the end, of the whole scheme of the national Constitution as designed and established by its framers and the people who adopted it.

We are not to answer just complaints of the behavior of the Senate by simply saying that it was intended by the Constitution to resist popular passion, and caprice, and impatience. It was intended also to enact into law the just and considerate desires of the people. We cannot answer complaints of modern degeneracy by appealing to ancient glory. The Senate must be justified by the behavior of the men who compose it now, and not by the behavior of the men who composed it in the time of our fathers. We must find a cure for existing evil. We must show that with added years our great legislative body is improving and not degenerating, or we must record not alone the shame of the people, but our own. We must look the grievance in the face. We have a right, when we do it, to show in what we have improved. We have a right to say that the evil influences of the lobby in legislation for private and not public ends, which, like the ointment of the hand, bewrayed themselves in the atmosphere of the Senate Chamber and in its corridors, are all gone to-day. We have a right to say that drunkenness, which existed when I first entered public life, is not known there to-day, and that Senators no longer bring whiskey-soaked brains to meet the high demands of the public service. We have a right to say that the use of executive patronage for personal advancement—so that each Senator who supported the Administration had a little army of followers devoted to his personal interests, supported at the public cost—has gone by. We have a right to say, also, that if important legislation, demanded for the public welfare, is often

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

defeated by obstructive measures or prolonged and needless debate now, for the eighty years while slavery ruled, and while the strict State-rights construction prevailed, such legislation was not even introduced and its chances were not worth considering. We have a right to say that the work the Senators now give to the public service, day and night, is a constant, hard work which was unknown in either House of Congress, save to a very few persons, fifty years ago. Men who belonged to the minority were not permitted to share even in the ordinary routine business of legislation. It was considered almost an audacity in former times for one of them to move to adjourn. Levi Lincoln told me that his time, when he was a Whig member of Congress, hung heavily on his hands, and that neither he nor any of his Whig colleagues was permitted to take the slightest share in the duties of legislation.

Talk about the degeneracy of the Senate! I am writing these lines upon the desk, I am seated in the chair, by whose side Charles Sumner was stricken down in the Senate Chamber for defending liberty,—his comely and beautiful head the target for a ruffian's bludgeon. There were Senators standing by and looking on and approving. There were others standing by without interfering. The Senate neither dared to punish nor to censure the action; and the offender was fined $300 in a police court. This was forty years ago. Read Oliphant's account of the passage of the reciprocity treaty of 1854,—a treaty which, as Lord Elgin described it, floated through on waves of champagne! Lawrence Oliphant, the British Secretary, tells the story to his mother,—a story, if it be true, as disgraceful to him and to his superior as to us. But he excuses himself with the comment, "If you have got to deal with hogs, what are you to do?"

Talk of the degeneracy of the Senate to men who remember the time when a Vice-President was inaugurated in a state of maudlin intoxication; or the earlier day when Foote uttered in debate his threat to Hale, that he should be hung on the tallest tree in the forest if he should come to Mississippi; when the same man drew his pistol on Benton in the Senate Chamber; when Butler poured out his loose expectoration, and Mason gave exhibitions of his arrogant plantation manners; or when Sumner likened Douglas to the noisome, squat, and nameless animal, who switched his tongue and filled the Senate with an offensive odor,—therein quoting an epithet once applied to Lord North in the House of Commons!

In 1876 it became my duty, in an important State trial, to point out to the Senate, then sitting as a court of impeachment, the corruption

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which had grown up in the country during and after the war. I did not exaggerate it in the least. But the evil which I then pointed out has been almost cured, so far as national politics is concerned, by an aroused and intelligent public sentiment. A day or two after my speech in the Belknap trial, I was sitting at lunch with General Garfield, talking over the subject. I told him that although all I had said was true, at the same time I believed that the amount of this evil was greater, not only in proportion but actually, during the first sixteen years of the Constitution—including the Administrations of Washington and John Adams and Jefferson's first term—than it was at the time we were speaking. He asked me to put together the facts, and to state them in a public speech. This I undertook to do, and in part did, in a speech made in the House of Representatives on August 9, 1876. But as I ransacked histories and old documents, I felt like a ghoul in reviving the evil stories of an age which we were accustomed to think so pure.

There has been great complaint of the recent policy of admitting new States. It is claimed that they were admitted solely to accomplish partisan objects; that the number of their people did not warrant bringing them into the Union; and that the conduct of their Senators, —especially in the matter of currency and finance—has been unpatriotic and highly injurious to the public interest.

Let us see how much truth there is in this complaint. The seven States to which this complaint applies are South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Washington, Wyoming,—all admitted between November 2, 1889, and July 10, 1890,—and Utah, admitted January 4, 1896. Nevada was admitted during the war, as a part of the Republican policy of Abraham Lincoln, it is said—I suppose truly—to secure the adoption of the Thirteenth Amendment. She had then a population of six thousand. She has now a population of forty-five thousand. Whatever injury the admission of Nevada caused, and whatever benefit came from the abolition of slavery, must be charged to profit and loss of the policies which saved the Union. In the seven States I have just mentioned, the aggregate population, in 1890, just after their admission, was 1,344,071—an average population slightly less than 192,000. Of the other thirty-eight States, there were but thirteen which had at the time of their admission a population equal to this average. There were only five which had a population equal to the three largest of these States; only three equal to the two largest. Eight at the time of their admission were smaller than the smallest of these new States; seventeen were smaller than the second smallest; and twenty were smaller than the third smallest.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now when we consider the great evil of governing these States in a Territorial condition—a very eminent statesman of large experience in the Cabinet and in the Senate told me the other day that a Territory was not much better than a bundle of snakes—and consider the fact of the rapid future growth to be expected from nearly all of them, I do not think so great a mistake was made in their admission as is sometimes supposed. Without accepting the above statement, I think it must be admitted that the government of Territories by our methods is very bad for governors and governed.

Great complaint has been made of the vote of these new States upon some questions which have arisen of late. It is said that their power has been exerted in favor of wild and dishonorable schemes which endanger the prosperity and honor of the country. But they have done no harm. When the purchasing clauses of the act of 1890 were repealed, their votes were evenly divided. Between McKinley and Bryan, they certainly did as well as the solid South. All the States that went into the rebellion voted for Bryan; and they were reinforced by Missouri. If we make a comparison of the large States and the small States, the States that have four Representatives, or less, did pretty well. They gave forty votes for McKinley to thirty-one for Bryan. The States that have two Representatives, or less, gave twenty-two votes for McKinley to thirty-one for Bryan.

Passionate complaints are made in some quarters of the personal quality of the Senators representing the new States. I think these complaints are in most instances the result of political prejudice, and that the gentlemen concerning whom they are made are industrious, honest, and faithful public servants. But the men who make them certainly express quite as much impatience with the Senators, past and present, from the largest States in the Union. I am not expressing or suggesting any judgment of my own. But these complainants certainly will be slow to admit that the great States have done better in this regard than the small ones.

There is a great deal which affects the character and happiness of a free people, which is not effected by its legislation, and with which neither statesmen nor politicians have to do. But it is likewise true that a good history of any civilized people can be written from its statutes. To this statement the United States is no exception. I think it would be easy from the history of the action of Congress to write the history of the intelligent opinions of the people. It would likewise be easy to show, if there were time and place for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an enumeration, that by far the larger part of the great and humane statutes by which the people have expressed their will have originated in the Senate. This is true, notwithstanding the fact that by the Constitution all money bills, including appropriation bills, must begin in the House, and that a great deal of such legislation has been placed upon appropriation bills.

At the session of Congress which has just closed, the Sundry Civil Appropriation Bill passed the House under a suspension of the rules. No member had an opportunity to discuss an item, or to move an amendment in an expenditure involving fifty-two million dollars. That bill was considered in the Senate. Large additions were made. They passed the House without opportunity for amendment or discussion. This was because that body did not dare trust itself to exercise its great responsibility freely and deliberately. The great statesman who is its leader is supported by a majority in the House in his iron rule, although there is much muttering and individual discontent. The majority of the House agree with him in thinking that it is not safe or practicable to trust the Representatives of the people to deal with the items of expenditure one by one after full discussion. There is no time for the discussion necessary to expose improper claims; and, in any such discussion and amendment as could be had, the good would be as likely to fail as the evil.

It is true that the House of Representatives has sometimes prevented the enactment of mischievous legislation which had passed the Senate, or would have passed the Senate if it had had an opportunity. But it is equally true that the House is a changeable body, and that nearly every alternate Congress is ready for what a large and most conservative portion of the people deem infinite mischief.

There were in the House elected in 1890, 167 Democratic majority. In the House elected in 1892 there were but 84 Democratic majority. This majority changed to a Republican majority of 137 at the next election. The House elected in 1892 contained 84 new members. The House elected in 1894, contained 168 new members. The present House, elected in 1896, although the same party remains in power there, contains 156 new members. In spite of the previous-question and the hour rule, the House at its best is an infinitely more obstructive body than the Senate. The obstructions in the Senate can be caused only by large minorities. Great measures are delayed and defeated by the power of 20 or 25 men out of 90. But the same thing is constantly done in the House by one man alone.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

You go to Mr. Speaker Reed and tell him you are poor, that you have an honest claim against the United States; that it has taken your entire property without compensation; that your claim has been found to be due by the Government's own court, appointed for that very purpose; that it has passed the Senate unanimously ten times; that ten committees of the House have reported in its favor; and you pray him to let your Representative tell the story to the House and ask them to pass it—a motion which, to be successful, requires a vote of two to one. He will answer you, that he has no doubt all you say is true; but that there are thronging at the gate millions of unjust, corrupt, or extravagant demands against the Treasury, which the House is eager to pass if it can get at them; and that he does not open the door to one honest claimant because, if he should, a hundred dishonest ones would pass in.

There are two reasons why we provide so carefully for paying the bonds: One—a good one—is, that this is required by honor and good faith. The other is a bad one; viz., that there are numerous powerful and wealthy persons interested in their payment. If, in cases like that I have described, we are not moved by the first reason, we must admit that we are only impelled by the last to keep faith with the bondholder. For myself, I have little respect for the man who keeps his credit good at his bank and cheats his washerwoman and his grocer; and I have as little respect for the statesmanship that deals with public obligations on the same principle. If ten men can defeat, and oftentimes do defeat, righteous legislation by too much debate in the Senate, one man can defeat it in the House by preventing all debate. Repudiation is repudiation, and dishonesty is dishonesty; whether the foreign bondholder or the humble citizen be the victim.

The promptness with which the House of Representatives deals with some important questions is a good thing; but its capacity for prompt action is purchased at the price of the repudiation of public debts, and the suppression of the constitutional rights, personal dignity, and official authority of the great mass of its members. Gentlemen occupy seats there who, from the beginning to the end of their term of service, are not permitted to make a motion or to utter a word to the assembly of which they are members. Perhaps wise legislation may be secured while one House is conducted on that principle; but I am afraid free government would not long endure if it were applied to both Houses.

The Senate contributes as large a part to the legislation of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country to-day as it has done at any period of our history. This legislation I believe is better done than ever before. As many good and wholesome laws are enacted to-day as have been at any other period of our history. This is true, although we must now legislate for seventy millions instead of for three millions; although the doctrines of State rights and strict construction are overthrown; although the subtleties of the question of currency and finance present themselves for solution as never before; although we have been brought so much nearer to foreign countries by steam and electricity, and our domestic commerce has multiplied many thousandfold. I believe the people, as a whole, are better, happier, more prosperous, than they ever were before; and I believe the two Houses of Congress represent what is best in the character of the people now as much as they ever did.

We must put a stop in some way to the obstruction by minorities of the will of the people and of the will of majorities. It must be done, if it can be done, without sacrificing the right of reasonable debate and of unlimited amendment. We have also to devise some way for securing the honest election of Representatives and Senators. If these two things can be accomplished, the legislation of the country will reflect the will and the character of the people. If it be bad, if it be unwise, if it be hasty, it will be because we have a bad, foolish, or rash people; and the people can be elevated only by the elevation of the personal character of the individuals who make up the state.

The Senate, as I have said, was created that the deliberate will, the sober second thought of the people might find expression. It was intended that it should resist the hasty, intemperate, passionate desire of the people. This hasty passion and intemperance is frequently found in the best men as in the worst. But so long as the political management of the country excites eager interest, so long these feelings will be excited; and when they are excited the body whose function it is to resist them will be, for the time being, an object of dislike and of attack. It has, therefore, always been true, is true now, and always will be true, that the Senate is an object of bitter denunciation by those persons whose purposes are thwarted or delayed. That will be especially true when the House and Executive, the popular majority, are of one way of thinking and the Senate, representing the will of the majority of the States, is of another way. It is fair, therefore, that the Senate should be judged not by considering its conduct or its composition at the time when the judgment is to be expressed, but by a review of a whole century of its history.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Delay, needless discussion, wrangle, public reproach of the Senate, postponement of much needed and desired legislation, disappointment of good men, are the price we pay for three things. They are to be remedied. If possible, they are to be amended. But the blessings they buy for us, even at their worst, outweigh ten thousand times the evil which attends them.

The things they buy for us are these: First. The possibility of a Union of forty-five States—soon to be fifty States—covering a continent larger than Europe, with greater interests and more precious hopes. But for the constitution of the Senate as it exists, these States would be separate nations, each with its standing army; each seaboard State with its navy; a line of custom-houses along every frontier; and a history made up of eternal wrangle, strife, and war. This condition of things would last until, one by one, the smaller States became the prey of the larger States, to repeat again the Old World's story of disappointment.

Not only are we saved from the necessity of maintaining standing armies and costly navies. We are saved from a war of tariffs. Here are forty-five sovereignties without a fortress or a custom-house on their frontiers toward each other, and with but one soldier to every three thousand people. We are saved from the contests which must grow up between different countries dwelling on the banks of great navigable rivers. We are saved from the strife which must be engendered by a great trade carried by rail through populous States. All this would have been impossible, but for the constitutional compromise from which came the Senate.

Second. The constitutional arrangement of the Senate protects the American people from government by a pure Democracy representing and enacting the immediate passion and desire of the passing hour. The President represents the majority of the whole people; the House of Representatives, the present and immediate popular desire of the constituencies. But the Senate stands also for the will of the American people. It stands for its deliberate, permanent, settled desire,—its sober, second thought.

Third. The present constitution of the Senate, though in this respect it might be altered by a change of rule, secures one place in our Government where debate is unfettered, and the power of amendment —perhaps more important even than free debate—is preserved to the fullest extent.

In the natural growth of the country—a growth fruitful of benefit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to mankind—the Senate feels the strain to which all other parts of our constitutional mechanism are subjected. We must adapt to the new conditions so much of our proceeding as may be within our own control. We must strive to secure action. The rest must depend on the intelligence and virtue of the people. A seat in the Senate is still the highest object of ambition which any State can confer on its children, and, with a single exception, the highest object of ambition within the gift of the country.

Suppose it turn out that the body, created that it might give effect to the sober and deliberate judgment of the people, and withstand excitement, folly, and haste, compelling deliberation and wisdom to prevail, should be itself under evil influences and be found only withstanding the best and never resisting the worst popular emotions. What must become of us then? The cure is to be not by changing our present mechanism, which is the best that could be devised, but only by those means that elevate and educate the people themselves. If the people themselves will learn to avoid those tempests of excitement which belong to what, in speaking of other countries, we call a populace, and utter only well-considered and deliberate judgments when dealing with great matters which concern their own welfare, every department of their Government will respond.

Certainly in no generation has there been such a powerful Drummond light turned upon the lives of public men as now. The desire of Mr. Sumner's old Roman to dwell in a glass house is almost literally realized. Not only is every word uttered by a Senator in public taken down in shorthand, but his footsteps are dogged. He is watched at every street corner. He is the object of caricature—sometimes good-natured, sometimes malicious. The press of each of the great parties attacks the leaders of the party to which it is opposed. The so-called "independent" press attacks the leaders of both indiscriminately, and with far less scruple. For one, I do not complain. I am willing to take my chances of the good opinion of my countrymen, even in going through this ordeal. The process is not an unhealthy one, so far as it affects the men who are subjected to it. I know well that the lessons from which I can derive most improvement come to me from my enemies and not from my friends; from critics, not from admirers. I often wonder at the generally sure instinct by which the people form accurate judgment of the characters of good and wise men of whom they read nothing but derision and calumny.

We should consider also how much of the disparagement of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Senate comes from men who judge quite as harshly of all other American institutions, of all American history and of the great characters of that history, both past and present. To men of this temper, so numerous nowadays, nothing seems to be worthy of respect. The fault is with the critic and not with the institution or the history. No man is a hero to his valet. The reason is not that the quality of the hero will not bear close inspection, but that the valet is of such quality himself as not to recognize greatness. The history of no people is heroical to its Mugwumps.

We must, so far as possible, limit national legislation to matters of first-rate importance. It must be marked by the greatest possible simplicity. The laws must be plain and few, such as are clearly required, and such as meet obvious wants. I agree with Dr. Channing that a refined and subtle policy of complicated legislation which cannot be understood but by laborious research and reasoning is hostile to the genius of Republican institutions.

Our people are as intelligent a people as live or as ever lived. But a people of seventy millions is an inconvenient tribunal to deal with complicated legislative mechanisms. The claim that the National Government was but an agency of the States, to be revoked by any one at its will, is departed never to return. But the constitutional principle which requires the most careful preservation of State authority, and the most zealous limitation in the exercise of national power, is sound and salutary and must not be forgotten.

Let us not think or speak of these, the best days of the American Republic as if they were the worst. Let us trust the Republic, and the ideas which are its strength and safety. Renown and grace are not dead. The patriotism which builded the Union, and the patriotism that saved it, burns brightly and purely as ever in the bosoms of the people. The youth who are pressing forward to take their share in our citizenship are not a whit behind their sires either in love of their country or in their capacity to govern it. Let us not forever be fixing our gaze upon warts and blotches. To the wisdom of experience let us add, as our great Teacher told us, the wisdom of hope; and let hope and trust and instinct claim a share in the guidance of affairs.

This Republic has weathered too many storms to go down in sunny weather, in calm seas, and in prosperous gales. The God who was with our fathers, if we will but trust in Him, will also be with us, their children.

GEO. F. HOAR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RETRENCHMENT,—OR RUIN?

An efficient republican form of government is the organization of an intelligent people into a political corporation by which *all* are pledged to maintain and protect the natural rights of *each*. And the natural rights of a person are: life, liberty, and the privilege of owning and controlling his lawful accumulations. In a state of savagery, each had to defend himself against all; but in civilization, Law—evolved out of the recognition of individual rights—compels all to protect each. It is logical therefore to state that, whenever a statute takes from the citizen, or abridges for the citizen, any part of his natural rights, civilization is retrograding and inviting a return, by revolution, to that barbaric condition in which each must defend himself.

The power to levy duties and collect taxes was vested in this democratic form of government for the sole purpose of raising revenues to protect the life, liberty, and property of each of its citizens. It never was intended that the legislative branch of the Government should impose taxation upon *all* to enrich a *few*. It never was suspected that the Government would use the power to tax for the purpose of increasing private incomes instead of public revenues. But, insidiously and designedly, the legislation of the United States has, at times, been manipulated so as to prescribe in many ways privileges for the few, and taxes and burdens for the multitude.

This is really a Government of committees. Each new Congress and Administration are merely committees raised from the entire body of the American people; and to them are committed certain duties and functions of government which the people themselves, in their primary capacity as a committee of the whole, cannot discharge or perform. And the mass of citizenship never did commit and never intended to commit to any legislative, judicial, or executive committee the power to abridge, to invade, or to destroy any inherent rights of individual citizens. The multitude of voting men in the United States never intentionally cast ballots in favor of taxing all of themselves, either directly or indirectly, for the purpose of putting money into the pockets of a few of themselves. Nor did they ever by vote declare

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in favor of taking the public domain away from the people for the purpose of donating it to corporations or bestowing it as a gratuity in single tracts upon individuals. Nor has the American ballot ever approved the raising of money from the people of all the States to improve alleged rivers and harbors—of a purely local utility—for the benefit of a relatively few citizens in single States.

The day of retrenchment, or the day of ruin, for this Government is awaiting the people of the United States in the not remote future. We shall very soon step from the nineteenth into the twentieth century. We shall carry with us either the germs of dissolution and decay or of life and conserved energy. To avoid the former and secure the latter the American people should begin at once in the household, in the factory, in the counting-room, in the management of great lines of transportation, and in all other incorporations of capital, to practise something of the economy and frugality which characterized our New England ancestors. The cost of local governments must be lessened. Administration of county and city and village affairs must be made more and more businesslike and economical. In short, the fixed charges of American citizenship must be cut down. To-day in many cities the rates of taxation reach from 3 to 6 per cent upon the assessed valuation. This is altogether unendurable. This creates discontent. This makes popular unrest. This came to us, in many instances, however, by levying taxes and issuing bonds as subsidies to railroads, or to construct unneeded sewers and pavements, or to erect city and county buildings of extravagant proportions and ostentatious styles. And not a few of those public debts for which we now suffer terrible taxes were conceived and suggested by promoters and speculators for their own profit. But the reasons for them, which were served steaming hot to the voters, were the "general welfare," and the delight of benevolently furnishing the poor and unemployed with remunerative work. But it never was surmised in the earlier days of this Republic that those who, by sobriety, industry, and frugality, had acquired property, must at last suffer a penalty, in the taxation of that property, to create artificial means of employing and compensating those who had been indolent, improvident, and intemperate. The founders never anywhere indicate that it is a duty of the state to provide remunerative occupation for the citizen. That vagary found expression in the statutes of France; and experimentation with it brought on revolution and a new Empire. It cannot be tried in this country without similar results.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Americans, if they sincerely wish to perpetuate the Republic, must return to the ancient faith, that the sole business of the Government is to protect life, liberty, and property. They must spurn the doctrines of communism, which would have the Government do everything for everybody. They must maintain their individuality by refusing to be pooled,—as to abilities, character, and earning capacities,—into guilds, trade-unions, or any other associations which tend to de-individualization and a return to tribal relations, under which a few head-men and braves think and act for the whole tribe.

The tendency to depend upon Government for favors—from the distribution of prize-package gratuities in the form of printed books and cent-a-packet garden seeds to the disbursement of millions of dollars upon harbors and rivers, the waters of which are never shadowed by a sail, nor vexed by a paddle-wheel—has been growing enormously in recent years. The annexed table has been specially prepared to show how in sixty years the cost of administering the Federal Government has been so augmented that in 1890, with a population of more than sixty-two millions, it was $4.75 *per capita;* whereas in 1840, with a population of less than eighteen millions, the *per capita* expense was only $1.41.

COST OF ADMINISTERING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(This table deals exclusively with single years, not with averages.)

Year.	Population on June 1.	Net ordinary expenditures in fiscal year.	Amount *per capita.*	Gross expenditures in fiscal year.	Amount *per capita.*
1840	17,069,453	$24,139,920	$1.41	$28,226,534	$1.65
1850	23,191,876	40,948,383	1.77	44,604,718	1.92
1860	31,443,321	63,200,876	2.01	77,055,126	2.45
1870	38,558,371	309,653,561	8.03	702,907,843	18.23
1880	50,155,783	267,642,958	5.34	700,233,238	13.96
1890	62,622,250	297,736,487[1]	4.75[1]	630,247,078	10.06

In the face of these figures, can any intelligent citizen fail to observe that, in proportion to cost, there can hardly be found a local government which makes so small a return to the citizen as that made by the Federal Government? Sound economists hold that, under ordinary conditions, the cost of administration should decline *per capita* as population increases. And no authority will contend that with a popula-

[1] If premiums were included, as was done in 1870 and 1880, the net expenditure would be $318,040,711, and the amount *per capita*, $5.08.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of sixty-two millions the cost *per capita* should aggregate three times as much as it was in 1840, when the census showed less than eighteen millions of people.

But, coming a decade nearer to the present, the following is a table showing the total expenditures of the United States from 1850 to 1890, in four periods of ten years each:—

TOTAL EXPENDITURES OF THE UNITED STATES FROM 1850 TO 1890, IN FOUR PERIODS OF TEN YEARS EACH.

(The amounts given are the totals for ten years, not the yearly averages.)

Period.	Net ordinary expenditures, *not* including premiums or interest.	Premiums.	Interest.	Paid toward extinguishment of public debt.	Gross expenditures.
July 1, 1850, to June 30, 1860	$568,363,368	$5,733,530	$27,729,197	$76,374,511	$678,200,606
July 1, 1860, to June 30, 1870	4,415,723,822	37,262,113	850,327,718	4,039,621,128	9,342,844,781
July 1, 1870, to June 30, 1880	1,631,164,380	25,271,375	1,058,852,635	4,126,676,615	6,841,965,005
July 1, 1880, to June 30, 1890	2,098,348,562	46,928,678	538,848,213	2,857,080,577	5,541,206,030

From 1870 to 1880, the total disbursements for *pensions* were $326,088,179, or 19.99 per cent of the net ordinary expenditures, not including premiums or interest.

From 1880 to 1890, the total disbursements for *pensions* were $702,232,652, or 33.47 per cent of the net ordinary expenditures, not including premiums or interest.

From July 1, 1890, to June 30, 1896 (a period of six years), the net ordinary expenditures, not including interest, were $1,977,379,887. At this rate of increase the net ordinary expenditures for the decade ending June 30, 1900, would aggregate $3,295,633,145,—nearly as much as for the *twenty* years ending June 30, 1890!

From July 1, 1890, to June 30, 1896, the interest on the public debt amounted to $182,394,108; making a total of $2,159,773,995.

During this period the total disbursements for *pensions* were $840,363,077, or 42.50 per cent of the net ordinary expenditures, not including interest.

Why should there be billions appropriated now, when five hundred millions to eight hundred millions would be sufficient for legitimate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

governmental disbursements? Does the appropriation of nearly eleven hundred millions of dollars by the Fifty-fourth Congress afford citizens more security for life, liberty, and property? Is it patriotism, or party policy and personal ambition, that, without particular regard to services rendered the Republic, constantly talk and vote in the American Senate and House of Representatives for an enlargement of the number of military pensioners? Why should the decade from 1880 to 1890 show more than seven hundred millions paid for pensions, when that from 1870 to 1880 shows less than four hundred millions? Have pension laws sometimes been made the means of converting rolls of honor into lists of mere beneficiaries, regardless of services or disabilities, merely to gain or to perpetuate party power? How shall revenues be devised that can automatically adjust themselves to the ever-expanding extravagance of pension laws which add annually to the rolls more than time and death remove? No good citizen objects to pensions for those real soldiers who incurred genuine disabilities in the service or consequent upon the service. But the thousands of men who draw pensions from the Government of the United States, because by sworn testimony they have proved themselves victims of chronic diseases, and at the same time have policies in life-insurance companies to which they have solemnly declared themselves free from all chronic maladies, aggregate a stupendous swindle upon citizens who pay taxes or upon those who carry life insurance. Why should not investigation be made and such cases eliminated from the pension rolls? How can any man, without perjuring himself, have a pension because he *has* a chronic disorder and a life-insurance policy because he *has not* such an affliction? And how many thousands of such cases now stain the pension rolls can only be ascertained by an investigation—which can be carried on easily and inexpensively—in which the Government and the life-insurance companies shall coöperate. Why not petition Congress to order such an inquiry? Who can be injured by it? Can honorable, truthful, and meritorious veterans suffer from such a cleansing of the pension rolls?

Next, let us take up the public-building mania, which has crazed Congressmen in so many districts, and caused the erection of custom-houses, court-houses, and post-offices of extravagant proportions and cost at inconsequential villages and little cities, all over the United States; needlessly disbursing millions upon millions of dollars. These buildings are appropriated for by every Congress. In nine cases out of ten they are not required; and when the public business does re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quire the erection of an edifice it is generally made bigger and more costly than it ought to be made. During the last nine years the appropriations for public buildings have aggregated more than forty millions of dollars.

The interest on half the money invested in the Public Building at my own town—Nebraska City, Otoe County, Nebraska—would rent quarters commodious enough and good enough for the post-office. And that is the only use the Government of the United States has for a building in that place; for it has less than fifteen thousand people. And what is true of the outlay of public money in that town for a Government building is true of scores of similar cities. But the most significant, unbusinesslike feature in this fallacy of furnishing elegant and expensive post-offices to certain towns in certain districts that are represented by those patriotic and rustling statesmen whose lives are fervidly spent in seeing how much they can get *out of* the people and the Government, rather than in seeing how much they can do or save *for* them, is the fact that, as soon as the post-office is finished, free delivery is instituted in the same community. Thus a fairly decent income from box-rents in the new building is cut off, and the utility of the edifice minimized to housing and assorting the mails. That was the case in Nebraska City. The history of the new building there, and of its extravagance in construction, heating, and manning with engineers, janitors, and watchmen, is the history of scores of post-offices scattered throughout the Union, which have been de-utilized to a great extent by being supplemented by an expensive, unnecessary, and farcical free-delivery system which never ought to have been established, and should not now be continued in any town of less than forty thousand population.

A tax, whether indirect or direct, is the payment which the citizen makes to the Government for the service which the Government renders him in the protection of his life, liberty, and property. A little money taken from each, and committed, for public purposes only, to those representing and acting for all, makes the revenue. And it is collected from each of the people to be legitimately expended only for conserving the rights of all the people. And as the population of the United States increases, the *per capita* cost of administration ought to diminish; provided good judgment, honesty, and a reasonable economy direct disbursements. But what do the figures from 1867 to 1896 teach as to this? The following table of net ordinary expenditures from 1867 to 1896 gives the answer:—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NET ORDINARY EXPENDITURES PER CAPITA OF POPULATION, 1867 TO 1896.
(From the Statistical Abstract of the Treasury Department.)

1867	$ 9.87	1873	$6.97	1879	$5.46	1885	$4.64	1891	$5.55
1868	10.21	1874	7.07	1880	5.34	1886	4.15	1892	5.28
1869	8.55	1875	6.25	1881	5.07	1887	4.47	1893	5.73
1870	8.03	1876	5.87	1882	4.89	1888	4.33	1894	5.39
1871	7.39	1877	5.21	1883	4.90	1889	4.38	1895	5.11
1872	6.84	1878	4.98	1884	4.39	1890	4.75	1896	4.94

Perhaps no other system of making appropriations has been so prolific of extravagant disbursements as that which sets apart gigantic sums of money in a sort of omnibus bill and terms it an appropriation for Sundry Civil Expenses. Under this masquerading legislation the Congress of the United States has deftly despoiled the National Treasury during the last twenty years of $510,988,245; and during the period from 1878 to 1887 this omnibus hauled out of the public Treasury more than $226,000,000. And all that almost incomprehensible and bewildering number of dollars had first been collected from the people.

This Government, like all others, is penniless and a pauper, except for the power to tax its citizens. It was born without money. It can create no money. It handles only tax-raised money. And it has no constitutional or other right to levy taxes, except for the purpose of getting money into its Treasury with which to pay the public debt, to provide for the common defence, and to promote the general welfare. All other taxes, some of them falsely called "protective," ought to be speedily and utterly abolished. The gigantic sums smuggled out of the Treasury, disguised as necessary for sundry civil expenses, are increasing from year to year. This is shown by the fact that during the years from 1888 to 1897 there was taken by this method $284,602,604. This startling sum is an increase of more than fifty-eight millions of dollars over the amount appropriated by the same system of false pretence in legislation in the preceding decade. Thus ten years developed an increase of 25 per cent in appropriations for "Sundry Civil Expenses." As a further comparison, the appropriations by Congress under this heading for the fiscal years 1878, 1879, and 1880, amounted to $61,772,715; while for the fiscal years of 1895, 1896, and 1897, the amount was $90,764,590,—an increase of more than 47 per cent.

Following closely upon the heels of the "Sundry Civil Expenses" method of burglarizing the United States Treasury, comes the annual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appropriation for Rivers and Harbors. This bill is a masked looter of the public funds; and its successes are often applauded by those deluded constituencies who follow predatory politicians because the swag is to be scattered in their immediate neighborhood. From 1878 to 1887, the money taken out of the Treasury for Rivers and Harbors aggregated only $86,730,070; but between the years 1888 and 1897 the same system of legislative piracy has taken from the public funds $134,158,925. Thus the total amount appropriated was about 55 per cent greater than during the preceding ten years. And how much more security to the life, liberty, and property of the American citizen was guaranteed by this expenditure of more than two hundred and twenty millions of tax-gathered dollars for harbors and rivers during the last twenty years? How much of that sum was absorbed in profits by political contractors? How much was needlessly expended? How much was intended and used for the promotion of personal, pecuniary, and political betterment?

But all sorts of schemes for tapping the public till are concealed in legislation simulating patriotic desire to advance and exalt the "plain people," about whom the ubiquitous and voluble office-hunter is ever discoursing with pathos and bathos. Among a multitude of those methods for getting money out of the United States Treasury for personal purposes which have succeeded best in recent years, none has been more adroitly worked than the "Exposition." It was inaugurated at Philadelphia to celebrate the Centennial Anniversary of this Republic in 1876. This first exposition appropriated for from the public Treasury was the beginning of a series of shows to be viewed and enjoyed by a few taxpayers at the expense of all the taxpayers of the United States. The annexed tabulated statement tells how much success in a financial way the "show business" as a function of Government has achieved. In the beginning of its career even the Philadelphians and other personally interested patriots dared to propose only a loan from the general Government; and no man declared for an out-and-out donation. The idea of a continuous line of "Mrs. Jarley's wax figgers" at governmental cost did not then exist, any more than the idea of stopping appropriations for such purposes exists now.

Where will promotion, establishment, and maintenance of exhibitions and expositions by the Government cease? Where is the line to be drawn? What rights to run shows at the Federal expense inhere at Philadelphia, New Orleans, Chicago, Atlanta, Nashville, or Omaha, that do not belong equally to Pittsburg, New York, Chicopee,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Atlantic City, Louisville, Kalamazoo, Oshkosh, Niagara Falls, or any other American town?

APPROPRIATIONS BY CONGRESS IN CONNECTION WITH THE PRINCIPAL EXPOSITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES, BEGINNING WITH THE CENTENNIAL, 1876.

Exposition.	Donations.	Appropriations for Government buildings and exhibits.	Total.
Philadelphia, 1876	[1]	$505,000	$505,000
New Orleans, 1884–85	$1,350,000 [2]	300,000	1,650,000
Chicago, 1893	2,500,000	2,668,354 [3]	5,168,354
Atlanta, 1896		200,000	200,000
Nashville, 1897		130,000	130,000
Omaha, 1898		200,000	200,000
Total	$3,850,000	$4,003,354	$7,853,354

The above table does not include the sum of $250,000 appropriated by Congress for the Paris Exposition of 1889, nor various small amounts expended in connection with other expositions at home and abroad.

The educational argument, and the assumption that such governmental expenditures inspire patriotism, and the assertion that they exalt, refine, and sublimate humanity in general, by taxing everybody to enable relatively nobody to have salaries and profits, see pleasant things and enjoy life intensely at the expense of the great majority who are not in attendance, are constantly reiterated by those voluble promoters of personal enterprises that are always masked as the "general welfare."

But it is unnecessary to elaborate or enumerate the evils of the Government show-business. It is only one of many modern methods of buncoing our common Uncle Sam out of the taxes which he has harvested from his full and applauding field of nephews. The Government waxwork business, menagerie and general show-business can only be destroyed by sending men to the National Legislature for the purpose of doing something *for* the people, instead of trying to get everything possible *out of* and *away from* the people. Statesmanship

[1] Congress loaned the Centennial Exposition $1,500,000, which was repaid.

[2] $1,000,000 of this amount was a loan; it was not repaid; and Congress had to appropriate a further sum of $350,000 to extricate the Exposition from its embarrassments.

[3] Actual disbursements by Treasury Department.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

needs a new definition in the United States. It now seems to many men, "the art of living profitably in office, and getting offices and appropriations for personal and political friends."

Formerly the youth of the United States came to adult age inspired with the patriotic idea that every American citizen should support the Government in war, in peace, and always. But to-day multitudes really hold that it is the duty of the Government to support its citizens—in office, with contracts, or by special legislation.

This article is hastily written merely as a suggester of serious thought among tax-paying and patriotic citizens upon the need of economy in the administration of Government, and it cannot be better quickly ended than by quoting the last annual report of John G. Carlisle, than whom there has never been an abler, more diligent and conscientious Secretary of the Treasury:—

"The great increase in the ordinary expenditures of the Government during the last seven years has been without precedent in our history, in time of peace, and presents a subject which imperatively demands the most serious consideration of Congress. In 1870, for the first time after the close of the War, our public expenditures, excluding premiums on loans and purchases of bonds, but including interest and pensions, fell below the sum of $300,000,000; and they continued to decrease, with some fluctuations, until 1886, when they reached their lowest point, amounting to $242,483,138.50. During the four fiscal years beginning July 1, 1885, and ending June 30, 1889, the annual average expenditure, excluding premiums on loans and purchases of bonds, but including all the other items mentioned above, was $263,016,473.18; but during the next four fiscal years, beginning July 1, 1889, and ending June 30, 1893, the annual average was $345,405,163.60,—an increase of $82,338,690.42 for each year. The average annual ordinary expenditure of the Government during the three fiscal years beginning July 1, 1893, and ending June 30, 1896, was $358,633,341.40,—an annual increase of $13,228,177.80 over the next preceding four years. The ordinary receipts of the Government during the last fiscal year—$326,976,200.38—would have paid the average annual expenditure during the four years from July 1, 1885, to June 30, 1889, and left a surplus of $63,959,727.20 at the end of each year, or of $255,838,908.80 at the close of the period. The expenditures for the year 1896, although $31,298,508.41 less than in 1893, were nearly 25 per cent higher than in 1889."

J. Sterling Morton.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE UNITED STATES AND CUBA.

THE Cuban problem, among all the problems which agitate our epoch, is certainly one of the most exciting; for, while full of deep reverberations both in the United States and in Europe, it is linked with an epic of other ages.

The sociologist, the philosopher, the statesman, agree that republicanism, so difficult to acclimatize on our old continent, is irresistibly destined to triumph among the nations of the New World; that the political changes in the Greater Antilles tend toward an industrial and commercial upheaval from which shall result moral transformations; and that the definitive victory of the revolution in Havana may possibly bring about the proclamation of a republic in Madrid. But the masses, always more impressed with facts than with abstract reasoning, see quite another thing.

They see two armies seeking each other, spying upon each other, pressing upon each other, and, for two years, mercilessly renewing the same struggle. The one, formidable in numbers and armament, led by generals starred with decorations, and marching with terror—if not with victory—amid the noise of fusillades, of women, and of prisoners; the other, six times less numerous, without pay, without uniform, with insufficient military equipment, but marching to battle with the cry of "Cuba libre!" shouted alike by beardless youths and old men whose bodies are riddled with bullets like a flag.

This latter army has with it the soul of the entire Cuban people. This it is, above all, that in France (and doubtless it is the same in America) strikes the masses,—at least that part of the masses wherein imagination, enthusiasm, and generous sentiments reside.

The Cuban revolution,—what a factor in the future transformation of the world; but then, also, what a prodigious epic! An epic in our prosaically sceptical society, when the old Republicans had declared the heroic age ended! Well, no! It has not ended,—at least, not everywhere; and it is just because the people do not live for the gratification of their material wants alone, but also for the ideal and in aspirations for the future, that they followed Barbès to the barricades, ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plauded Garibaldi, saluted John Brown, and to-day unite in imagination in glorifying the imposing figure of Maceo. Not a day passes that men of all ages do not present themselves at the office of the "Intransigeant" and ask to be enlisted to fight for Cuba; and they grow disconsolate when told that our third Republic, more retrograde than the old monarchy of divine right, does not countenance Lafayettes and Rochambeaux.

For nearly a century and a half France has felt its heart throb within the bosom of all oppressed nationalities. Its geographical situation and the origin of its ethnical elements have made of it in the past a field of battle: some day they will make of it a ground of union between the Celtic, Latin, and Saxon races. It is not, therefore, surprising that the French have, in thought, communed with other nations; that their patriotic spirit—sometimes clamorous, but far from confining itself to a selfish particularism—should have always been imbued with a profound humanitarian sentiment. The same country that, since the last century, has enlightened the world by its philosophers, has often, too, shed its blood for the enslaved; compelling even monarchs, such as Charles X and Napoleon III, to come to the aid of insurgent Greece and of Italy.

How then, without ignoring all the traditions of republican France, without declaring the moral rôle of our country forever at an end, could our countrymen declare themselves indifferent in presence of the titanic struggle undertaken by the Cuban people to obtain their independence?

Scepticism, joined to an unbridled desire for pleasure, which is the characteristic of our times, is followed, like all other excess, by a reaction. It is exactly for this reason that, while, amid the general debasement of character, the men of to-day appear for the most part vulgar, covetous, and contemptible, enthusiasm and sympathy are enlisted in behalf of those whom the smallness of their contemporaries makes appear all the more great.

Such are the psychological and ethical causes which in our country draw to the insurgents of the Antilles all hearts responsive to a lofty thought, a generous sentiment. How much more actively ought these sympathies to manifest themselves in the great American republic, which, by its proximity, as well as by economic interests, is bound to Cuba, and which certainly has not forgotten in a century the history of its struggles for its own independence.

Reflection for a single moment in men of good faith would suffice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to definitely answer the question, "Who is the adversary that endeavors to retain Cuba under its yoke?" This adversary is the most retrograde and the most savagely ecclesiastical monarchy in Europe; the one which, at the present moment, under a varnish of constitutional government, exerts an intolerable oppression over free thought, reëstablishes in its prisons the tortures of the Middle Ages, and sullies itself by atrocities similar to those perpetrated by the worst of despots,—the Bourbons of Naples, the Stambouloffs, and the Abdul-Hamids. It is the power, at once imbecile and tyrannous, that disseminates everywhere anger and revolt,—in the Philippine Islands, as well as in Cuba,—after having caused the whole of Latin America to rise up against it.

Between republican Cuba and monarchical Spain, can those hesitate who believe in the meaning of the words "progress," "liberty," "humanity"?

To take the side of the executioners against their victims, on the ground that there are in the Greater Antilles negro inhabitants (albeit inferior in number to the white population), would be a simple monstrosity for those who proclaim the Rights of Man and the principles of Equality of the French Revolution, as well as for those whose fathers have fought for the abolition of slavery. On the other hand, ignoring the ethnical traits created more by environment and social conditions than by the color of the skin, have we not seen by a number of events, most of them recent, how erroneous was the theory of "the superior races"?

Which, then, is the greater figure, the Ethiopian Menelik, or the European Baratière? And would it not be infinitely more glorious to be a mulatto like Maceo than a Castilian like Canovas?

The modern Latin nations, whatever may have been their literary, artistic, or even military, glories, have never, it must be confessed, known how to colonize. In their hands, the countries beyond the seas have become the prey of all those favorites upon whom the mother country has bestowed office; of cantankerous bureaucrats; of administrative officials swelled with their own importance. The church and the barracks were the two sacrosanct institutions; and government by the sword and the *goupillon* has very naturally extended across the seas from the conquering country to the conquered.

While England, profiting by the lessons of history, endowed Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the Cape with autonomous institutions, and allowed initiative action to freely take its course sheltered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from official interference, giving over the country not to functionaries, to soldiers, and to priests, but to the civil and laboring population,—the producers of all wealth,—Spain persevered in the errors of the past. She had lost Mexico, Peru, Chile, Argentina, and Guatemala in less than fifteen years by the revolt of their exasperated inhabitants. But this lesson did not suffice. On the contrary, the colonies which still remained to it, notably Cuba, were ground down more cruelly than ever, and were obliged to pay for themselves and for those that had shaken off the yoke.

Robbed, gagged, having no influence where their interests were concerned,—for all their rulers (one might say their convict-keepers) were sent them from the mother country, which chose by preference the ruined gamblers of the court,—enjoying in reality, despite a seeming semi-liberty of the press, no constitutional guarantees whatever,—for the Captain-General assumed all power, as he does to-day,—the Cubans, after patient endeavors to obtain pacifically the most indispensable reforms, realized that their only effective course was a resort to arms; and, on October 10, 1868, the first insurrectional movement broke out at Yara.

I will not review this epic, which endured for ten years,—one year longer than the struggle of the Gauls against Cæsar. Half-naked, almost without arms, led by chiefs that no peril daunted, no obstacle, however great, repelled, and who to-day meet again as old men in the new revolution, the Cubans inflicted upon their enemies a loss of one hundred thousand men and of nearly one thousand millions. And these, finally incapable to crush the rebellion, were forced to treat with it. The pact of Zanjon, concluded between Martinez Campos and the Cuban chiefs, stipulated a number of reforms: administrative decentralization, admission to public office by competitive examination, establishment of new customs laws, creation of boards of works, representation in the Cortes on the basis of copyhold tenure; finally and above all, cessation of a shameless system of malversation.

Of these clauses, some were flagrantly violated, others were put in force under conditions that worked to the disadvantage of the Cubans. Thus it was that a *law of mercantile relations* was enacted, which, instead of reforming the customs system in a liberal sense, strengthened existing protection, compelling the island, without any kind of reciprocity, to supply itself with the costly and indifferent products of Spain. The presence of Cuban representatives in the Chamber and Senate of Madrid served only to demonstrate the complete futility of this measure,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the voices of these few men were drowned by ministerial majorities. In short, thefts and peculation became worse.

The Cubans could thus by experience convince themselves that the Liberals were no better than the Conservatives. The only rôle the one or the other assigned to them was in fact that of taxpayers.

Deceived, robbed, subjected to incessant arbitrary acts, eaten up by militarism and bureaucracy, hindered in the free cultivation of the most fertile soil in the world,—for it was above all necessary to favor Spanish importation, which had lost all its other outlets,—the Cubans felt their misery all the more, from having before their very eyes the picture of the great American republic, so free, so prosperous.

They realized anew that force alone could insure the success of their claims. It was at this moment that José Martí appeared.

The American continent is acquainted with the life and death of this man, as great as he was modest, whose every effort was devoted to the realization of that grand idea,—"Cuba libre." An organizer of the first order, writer, counsellor, indefatigable conspirator,—the Antillian Mazzini prepared during ten years the elements and resources of the second revolution. It broke out on February 24, 1895, and has continued ever since.

Two years of desperate conflicts—ruinous for Spain, which is to-day on the verge of bankruptcy—have not weakened the efforts of the insurgent patriots. In the United States, better than anywhere else, one could follow day by day the varying fortune of this titanic duel: the landing of the two Maceo brothers, survivors of a family of heroes, both of whom were to find, a few months apart, the most glorious of deaths; the advent in the campaign of Maximo Gomez, the veteran of the ten years' insurrection; the death of Martí, fallen in ambuscade before seeing the triumph of his labor; the revolt deepening, spreading from the eastern to the western department, toward Pinar del Rio, and threatening Havana; the recall of Martinez Campos, powerless to conquer; his replacement by General Weyler, a wild beast with a human countenance; and finally, the dissolution, greater each day, of the prestige and credit of monarchical Spain.

This is the state of things at present: The entire people of the United States have espoused the cause of those who are struggling with so much valor and abnegation to break so odious a yoke. Will the Federal Government show itself less generous than the great nation in the name of which it speaks? Will the American eagle allow the Spanish vulture to settle upon its prey?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Certainly, international policy is not determined by sentiment alone. But reason and interest in no wise conflict with the sympathy which the cause of free Cuba can awaken in America and even among the democratic nations of Europe.

The greed of those who have kept the island in subjection has prevented it from developing. But it is evident that the advent of a new era of political liberty will cause the fall of the old economic barriers so jealously created and maintained. Commercial transactions,—chiefly with the United States,—imports and exports, will cease to be subjected to crushing duties. Cuba, without passing through ruinous intermediaries, will be able to enrich the international markets with its sugar, its coffee, its tobacco, and in return will receive manufactured products which it still lacks. Americans and Europeans will be able to establish themselves and work in peace in an island that requires but brawn and muscle to see its wealth increased tenfold.

Societies have their laws of evolution, against which the will of a few despots or exploiters cannot prevail. Having reached a certain degree of development, and being governed against their interests by a blind metropolis, colonies must either end in emancipating themselves or in perishing.

If, by extraordinary circumstances, Cuba should not emerge victoriously from the present struggle, the question will not be settled for all that. Peace would become but a brief truce, a preparation for a renewed resort to arms; a new Martí, a new Gomez, a new Maceo would arise; one would see other Calixto Garcias marching to battle as old men bearing upon their brows—engraven by a bullet—the lone star of Cuba.

Rather than await further struggles,—floods of blood and accumulation of ruins to end in the inevitable,—is it not better to settle the matter now? The great American republic holds in its hands the destiny of an oppressed people, whose heroism and patriotic sacrifices have rendered it a hundred times worthy of liberty. Will the United States decline to speed the hour of justice?

"What will become of Cuba, once it is separated from Spain?" we are asked, with a feigned anxiety, by those who are so interested in the welfare of the island that they prefer to see Order reign there in the fashion of Weyler, rather than confront the possible risks of a stormy liberty at the outset. "Will peace be reëstablished as by enchantment?" "Will not the island be destined to come under the rule of the United States, increasing still more their great power?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I do not pretend to forecast the future at long range; for an unknown factor may arise at any moment to overthrow the most plausible hypotheses. We can only adduce our knowledge from the past, and state conditions in the present. Once their liberty acquired, the Cubans will do what they deem most necessary to their interests, and will conclude with other nations such economical or political agreements as they may approve.

The United States have too often shown their abstinence from any policy of conquest for them to be accused of endeavoring to do with Cuba what they declined to do with the Sandwich Islands when a powerful and the ruling party of that power offered to them the possession of that archipelago.

That particularly intimate relations will be established between Americans and Cubans is likely and very desirable.

We are now at an era when the old barriers, between which the despotic governments fenced in the nations, are more and more destined to fall. The increasing needs of civilization and the development of natural affinities conspire to merge and fuse human groups far more surely than conquest. Reconciliations based upon entire liberty and respect of mutual rights,—should these cause us any uneasiness, when we earnestly wish for the termination of international conflicts and the advent of a grand federation of nations?

Meanwhile, until progress shall, sooner or later, realize this ideal, as it has realized the suppression of prehistoric anthropophagy and ancestral barbarities, we shout, "Cuba libre!"

Revolutions can never be defined; and it is possible that, after a long rule of pitiless suppression, the exuberance of the newly emancipated may be great at the beginning. And afterward? Have not nations their periods of youth and maturity the same as individuals? Is it necessary to remind our Republicans of the motto of the Palatine Posnanie: "Better a stormy liberty than a calm of servitude"?

The cause of the Cuban insurgents is that of Humanity. We see, too, even among the Spaniards themselves—whom it would be profoundly unjust to class as a mass with the Canovas and Weylers—the most respected men of the democracy, such as Pi y Margall, the former president of the republic, declare their sympathy for the brave patriotic fighters, their abhorrence for the butcher general who maintains order by means of ambuscade, torture, the shooting of prisoners, and the violation and massacre of women. It would need volumes to recount the transgressions of this monster whom, since the first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insurrection, the Cubans had named "the Hyena," as they had called his superior officer, Balmaceda, "the Tiger." The American continent has been aroused from one ocean to the other. From Hudson's Bay to Tierra del Fuego, there has been but a cry of horror against this miserable torturer and perjurer, who, always defeated by the heroic Maceo and threatened by him even in the capital itself, has only been able to come to an end with his formidable adversary by having him murdered!

What a contrast to the conduct of the Cuban general, causing wounded Spaniards to be nursed, and setting prisoners at liberty! If walls, which it is said have ears, had also a voice, those of Morro Castle could tell a tale of numberless atrocities, the knowledge of which, by fragments, has reached even to us: the accumulation of suspects of all ages in underground places without air and without light; tortures, similar to those of Montjuich,—crushing of the organs, deprivations of food and drink,—inflicted upon prisoners to force them to betray their friends and parents; secret executions; and drownings.

All this is done in the name of Order, as it was also in the name of Civilization that the Spaniards imported into Cuba the garrote; while the Americans, on the other hand, built railroads there.

Of this "Order," which may be described as spoliation in time of peace, and assassination in time of war, the Cubans will have no more at any price. It would be difficult to say they are wrong.

Alone or not alone, they will continue to struggle until the monster who holds them relinquishes his prey. But America—Saxon and Latin America,—the America of Washington and Bolivar will not leave them without assistance. It would lie to itself, its principles, its destiny, its still recent but already great history, if in this combat to the death between republican liberty and monarchical despotism, between the Future and the Past, it should allow the latter to strangle the former.

HENRI ROCHEFORT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FUTILITY OF THE SPELLING GRIND.

In the opening articles of the present series, I endeavored to prove that the first step toward placing elementary education on a scientific basis must necessarily lie in determining what results may reasonably be expected at the end of a given period of instruction. If we have no definite notions in regard to what our teachers ought to accomplish, our ideas must be doubly vague as to how much time need be devoted to each branch. And, as long as this remains unanswered, no well-founded opinion can be given concerning the possibility of broadening the course of study without detriment to the formal branches,—the point around which the entire question of educational reform revolves.

Believing that the most rational method of determining what our teachers might be expected to accomplish would lie in discovering what results the more successful ones had been able to obtain, I ventured to undertake a series of researches which I hoped might serve as an initial step toward bringing this problem to a solution. And it is upon the data thus collected that this and the remaining articles of my series will be based.

The material to be submitted in the present article is intended to show what our teachers have accomplished in spelling, and what, therefore, may be reasonably demanded of our schools in this subject. The traditional standard in spelling is perfection; but this standard is unreasonable, and cannot be too soon abandoned. In view of the fact that in many cases the spelling faculty is weak, perfection could not be attained even if the number of words taught in an eight-year course should not exceed a thousand. And when we consider that the number of words in ordinary use is certainly not less than 15,000, including derivatives,—and the derivatives are frequently difficult to spell,—the absurdity of our standard becomes evident. Moreover, as some of our most scholarly people are deficient in spelling, and as, in this subject, some of the brightest pupils cannot keep pace with the dullest, our high-pitched sensibilities on the spelling question may be regarded as one of the mysteries of civilization. If these facts

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were more fully considered, we should undoubtedly feel more inclined to pardon an occasional mistake in spelling, and to refrain from abusing the schools for a weakness which, whatever might be done by our teachers, could not be overcome.

My researches in spelling were begun in February, 1895, and extended over a period of sixteen months. During this time three different tests were made; the number of children examined reaching nearly 33,000. In the present paper, space will permit me to state only the results of these tests, with certain conclusions that I have drawn from them; while I shall be obliged to defer to the next article the details concerning the methods of teaching, and the influences of certain modifying conditions, such as age, nationality, and environment, which were studied as closely as possible in order that the comparisons might be fairly drawn. The results of the various tests, which are shown side by side in the accompanying tables, will be fully explained.

My first test consisted of the following fifty words: furniture, chandelier, curtain, bureau, bedstead, ceiling, cellar, entrance, building, tailor, doctor, physician, musician, beggar, plumber, superintendent, engine, conductor, brakeman, baggage, machinery, Tuesday, Wednesday, Saturday, February, autumn, breakfast, chocolate, cabbage, dough, biscuit, celery, vegetable, scholar, geography, strait, Chicago, Mississippi, Missouri, Alleghanies, independent, confectionery, different, addition, division, arithmetic, decimal, lead, steel, pigeon. These words, together with a set of questions concerning the methods employed by the teachers, as well as particulars in regard to the pupils, were sent to school superintendents in various sections of the United States. Of these superintendents, some twenty responded; sending me, in total, the work of more than 16,000 children. Of the two tables presented with this article, the first shows the general average obtained in individual cities by grades, every class-room examined being represented in the figures; while the second shows the results in individual schools,—the most characteristic among those examined having been selected for publication in this form. In the first table the results of only two tests are shown; while the second includes the results of the three. As it was thought inadvisable to publish the names of the localities from which the papers were received, the various cities have been represented by numbers, and the individual schools by letters. All the papers received are still in my possession.

On directing our attention to the results of the first test we are startled by the enormous variations, when the extremes are consid-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ered,—particularly in the fourth-year classes, where the averages range from 33 to 95.3 per cent. Such brilliant results as the latter might lead one to believe that the spelling problem had already been solved, and that nothing was needed to put all our teachers on the right path beyond a careful study of the methods employed where the highest standards had been secured, and carrying the message to those whose results had been less favorable.

As the replies to my questions concerning the methods used by different teachers were not sufficiently clear to enable me to penetrate to the root of the matter, I decided to undertake a special tour for the purpose of obtaining more definite information from the teachers who had taken part in the test. During this tour, which extended over a period of two months, more than two hundred teachers were visited. Long before I had reached the end of my journey my fondest hopes had fled; for I had learned from many sources that the unusually favorable results in certain class-rooms did not represent the natural conditions, but were due to the peculiar manner in which the examinations had been conducted. As the tests had not been made under my personal supervision, I could not, of course, vouch for the figures; and, having found that under these circumstances experienced school people were unwilling to accept them, I was obliged to become resigned to the idea that most of my trouble had been for nothing.

An unfortunate feature of the first test was the fact that in many of the words careful enunciation would give the clue to the spelling. In such words, for example, as *tailor*, *doctor*, *different*, *independent*, the difficulty is entirely obviated by placing the accent on the last syllable. Under these circumstances, even the most conscientious teachers could not fail, unwittingly, to give their pupils some assistance, if their enunciation were habitually slow and distinct; while in those instances in which my test had been looked upon as an opportunity for an educational display—in which the imperfections of childhood were not to be shown,—the teachers had been afforded the means of giving their pupils sufficient help, through exaggerated enunciation alone, to raise the class average very materially. I am confident, however, that, if any irregularities were practised, they were committed without the knowledge of the superintendents, who as a class are well known to discountenance such acts and do all in their power to stamp them out. That, moreover, in the vast majority of instances, the teachers were conscientious, is proved by the numerous papers sent to me in which the results were unfavorable.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If I could safely have done so, I should have discarded the first test entirely rather than express these doubts. But to ignore this test might have submitted me to the charge of hiding results which did not substantiate my pedagogical theories; whereas, in truth, I had fully determined, in advance, to base my theories on the facts, whatever their nature might be. As the results of the second and third tests are placed side by side with those of the first, no danger can arise by presenting figures which, if shown by themselves, might be misleading.

In view of my doubts concerning the first test, I decided to undertake another, and to personally supervise the examinations. Moreover, by giving a second test I believed that I might be able to discover whether or not my fears had been well founded. In the latter the words were written in sentences; fifty test-words being employed in the fourth- and fifth-year classes, and seventy-five in the sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-.[1] In preparing this test special care was exercised to omit words whose pronunciation would tell the secret.

In the second test more than 13,000 children were examined under my personal direction; and the papers, although temporarily marked by the pupils, were finally corrected by my assistants. Although I could not be present in every room during the entire course of the examination, and although children cannot be prevented from copying,

[1] While *running* he *slipped*. I *listened* to his *queer speech*, but I did not *believe* any of it. The *weather* is *changeable*. His loud *whistling frightened* me. He is *always changing* his mind. His *chain* was *loose*. She was *baking* cake. I have a *piece* of it. Did you *receive* my letter? I heard the *laughter* in the *distance*. Why did you *choose* that *strange picture*? **Because* I *thought* I liked it. It is my *purpose* to *learn*. Did you *lose* your *almanac*? I gave it to my *neighbor*. *I was *writing* in my *language* book. Some children are not *careful enough*. Was it *necessary* to keep me *waiting* so long? Do not *disappoint* me so *often*. I have *covered* the *mixture*. He is *getting better*. *A *feather* is *light*. Do not *deceive* me. I am *driving* a new horse. *Is the *surface* of your desk *rough* or *smooth*? The children were *hopping*. This is *certainly* true. I was very *grateful* for my *elegant present*. If we have *patience* we shall *succeed*. He met with a *severe accident*. *Sometimes* children are not *sensible*. You had no *business* to *answer* him. You are not *sweeping properly*. Your reading shows *improvement*. The ride was very *fatiguing*. I am very *anxious* to hear the news. I *appreciate* your kindness, I *assure* you. I cannot *imagine* a more *peculiar character*. I *guarantee* the book will meet with your *approval*. *Intelligent* persons learn by *experience*. The peach is *delicious*. I *realize* the *importance* of the *occasion*. Every rule has *exceptions*. He is *thoroughly conscientious; therefore* I do trust him. The elevator is *ascending*. Too much *praise* is not *wholesome*.

The fourth- and fifth-year test ends with "This is *certainly* true." The higher test includes all the sentences except the four marked with an asterisk. The test-words are italicized.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

especially where the rooms are furnished with double seats and where the teachers have no control over their classes, I nevertheless believe that, for all practical purposes, the results of the second test demonstrate quite fairly what the children were able to do. In addition to those already mentioned, an indirect test in spelling was made in the form of compositions. The compositions represented the reproduction of a story specially prepared for the purpose. This story, which was accompanied by a picture, was read to the pupils by the teacher. The compositions also, in a large number of schools, were prepared under my personal supervision, and in many others under the special supervision of persons whose conscientiousness could not be doubted. In those cases in which the papers were marked for spelling, I feel morally certain that the true results were shown.

The marks for the language spelling which may be found in table No. 2, are based on the actual number of words written by the child, and represent the number of correctly spelled words per hundred. When the same word was misspelled more than once in an individual composition, only one error was counted. The average ages were computed from the returns of the first test. The details concerning this question, as well as the time devoted to spelling, will be more fully considered in my next article.

Of the three examinations, the first has been generally regarded as the least efficient in demonstrating the child's ability to spell, as such a test does not represent what he is able to do in ordinary writing. That this argument is worthy of some consideration, particularly in the case of the more immature children, is indicated by the fact that some of the fourth-year averages which on the first test were in the thirties, on the second advanced to the seventies. The second test appeared to meet with general approval, although a few teachers believed it too difficult for the sixth-year classes. As the test was purely comparative, however, this objection could not affect its validity. As to the comparative merits of the sentence- and the composition-tests, most teachers favor the latter, on the ground that the most rational test of the child's ability is one that shows his power to apply what he has learned. On the other hand, some have argued in favor of the sentence-test, believing that compositions do not include a sufficiently broad range of words to show the pupil's strength in all directions. If, however, an agreement might be secured to judge the spelling by the general written work, at least a temporary standard would be indicated by the results of my composition-test, which lead to certain definite conclusions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TABLE NO. 1.

GENERAL AVERAGES FOR CITIES.

City Number.	4th Grade.					5th Grade.					6th Grade.					7th Grade.					8th Grade.					City Number.
	First Test.			Second Test.		First Test.			Second Test.		First Test.			Second Test.		First Test.			Second Test.		First Test.			Second Test.		
	Average Age.	No. Papers Ex.	Average %.	No. Papers Ex.	Average %.	Average Age.	No. Papers Ex.	Average %.	No. Papers Ex.	Average %.	Average Age.	No. Papers Ex.	Average %.	No. Papers Ex.	Average %.	Average Age.	No. Papers Ex.	Average %.	No. Papers Ex.	Average %.	Average Age.	No. Papers Ex.	Average %.	No. Papers Ex.	Average %.	
1	11.4	205	70.8	114	66.7	12.4	171	78.1	120	78.1	13.2	131	86.9	91	74.9	14.3	123	88	74	77.6	15	86	93.6	87	84.6	1
2	10.9	183	51.9	.....	.....	11.6	194	67.6	.....	.....	12.9	218	75.4	.....	.....	13.8	187	84.3	.....	.....	14.6	187	89	.....	.....	2
3	12.2	147	56.1	.....	.....	13.3	78	66.9	.....	.....	13.8	58	76.6	.....	.....	14.8	40	81	.....	.....	16	23	82	.....	.....	3
4	12.7	174	50	.....	.....	12.4	190	64.3	.....	.....	13.3	123	71.3	.....	.....	14	120	82.7	.....	.....	14.9	153	85.5	.....	.....	4
5	10.7	94	62.9	.....	.....	11.8	145	69.5	.....	.....	13.7	172	79.8	.....	.....	13.5	147	84	.....	.....	14.3	81	85.7	.....	.....	5
6	11.6	132	61.8	.....	.....	12.3	140	70	.....	.....	13	104	81.5	.....	.....	14.5	91	79.5	.....	.....	15.4	66	81	.....	.....	6
7	11.1	479	41.3	304	63.9	11.9	436	58.6	319	75.3	12.9	553	67.9	432	69.4	13.7	574	78	283	76.5	14.8	376	82.1	409	82.8	7
8	11.6	166	46.7	.....	.....	12.2	137	59.4	.....	.....	13.2	120	81.3	.....	.....	14.6	123	79.6	.....	.....	15	86	86	.....	.....	8
9	11.4	132	79.6	345	67.9	12.6	239	83	312	76	13.7	382	86.5	251	73.2	14.8	232	89.6	229	82.8	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9
10	11.1	146	45.4	191	65.4	12.4	165	65	200	73.8	13.6	91	69.8	194	67.4	14.2	87	74.9	86	81	15.2	98	78.5	100	83.3	10
11	11.2	213	53.6	.....	.....	12.5	132	66.6	.....	.....	13.1	197	79	.....	.....	14.5	140	83.7	.....	.....	15	50	90.9	.....	.....	11
12	.....	.....	.....	466	57.7	.....	.....	.....	362	73.4	.....	.....	.....	237	75.9	.....	.....	.....	89	84.6	.....	.....	.....	154	90.6	12
13	12	280	56.5	.....	.....	13.1	296	66	.....	.....	14	137	75	.....	.....	14.6	165	79.8	.....	.....	15.9	59	85.1	.....	.....	13
14	11.2	236	57.5	.....	.....	12	240	65.3	.....	.....	12.7	179	71.3	.....	.....	14.3	206	77	.....	.....	14.5	188	82.2	.....	.....	14
15	.....	120	54.1	389	69.3	.....	87	68.2	525	77	.....	64	73.7	401	70	.....	78	85.6	262	79.8	.....	73	89.6	211	86.1	15
16	11	142	47.6	173	64.7	12.2	150	62.2	189	75.1	13.2	150	68.7	107	63.8	14	110	76.4	175	72.7	15.3	123	77.7	127	81.8	16
17	11.6	129	50.2	.....	.....	12.4	138	64	.....	.....	12.6	121	76.1	.....	.....	14	100	78.2	.....	.....	15.3	81	84.9	.....	.....	17
18	11.6	194	56.5	.....	.....	12.7	172	71.9	.....	.....	13.5	162	81.9	.....	.....	14.4	36	87	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	18
19	11.1	227	55.3	146	59.1	12.7	326	67.3	209	71.2	13.8	327	73.8	164	67.7	14.6	298	79	172	78.3	15.7	231	86.1	133	83.5	19
20	11.8	264	48.7	.....	.....	12.7	286	68.4	.....	.....	13.2	269	72	.....	.....	14.3	254	82.8	.....	.....	15.6	144	86	.....	.....	20
21	11.1	157	51.5	.....	.....	12.2	97	59.5	.....	.....	12.9	104	73.3	.....	.....	14	73	79.6	.....	.....	14.9	57	82.3	.....	.....	21
General Averages.	.....	3820	53.5	2128	64.2	.....	3819	64.3	2236	75.1	.....	3662	75.6	1877	70.4	.....	3184	81	1370	78.8	.....	2162	84.2	1221	84.4	General Averages.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In regard to the first test, I shall do no more here than direct attention to a few facts substantiating my statements concerning its validity. In the first place, it will be seen, by glancing over the averages in the last two columns of the second table, that the schools which towered above the others on the first test showed no marked superiority on the second. This is strikingly apparent in the case of School A, No. 9, which, on the first test, stood head and shoulders above the others, and, on the second, secured only eleventh place among the twenty-one on my list. The condition becomes doubly interesting when these marks are compared with those secured on both tests by School A, No. 7.

In order to allay my fear of harboring unwarranted suspicions in the case of the remarkable class average of 95.3, secured in the fourth grade of School A, No. 9, I compared the papers of the individual pupils who had taken part in the first test with those presented by the same pupils on the second. Most of these pupils, in the meantime, had been promoted to the fifth grade. Of course if their papers had again shown the same degree of perfection, it would have been but fair to conclude that the figures at first secured were reliable, and that we had simply discovered a remarkable group of children. The second examination proved, however, that these children had not been born in Wonderland, but that they were of the very same stamp as other children had proved to be. In fact the average made on the second test by those who had received 95.3 on the first was only 73, or exactly the same as that made by the pupils of School A, No. 7, who on the first test obtained not more than 41.

In Schools E and H, No. 15, the figures are reliable, as the words were dictated by myself. Again, in City 18, the examinations were made in my presence, the words being dictated by the teachers. In no instance in which the tests were made under my supervision—the words being pronounced by either the teacher or myself—was the class average for the fourth year, in boys' or mixed schools, higher than 59 per cent. I desire to say, in passing, that the results in the girls' schools were higher than those in the boys' and mixed schools. In the accompanying tables the girls' schools have been omitted; otherwise the comparison would have been misleading. They will be considered separately.

Leaving the first test and directing our attention to the others, we are confronted by a number of interesting phenomena, almost equally manifest in both. The most striking of these are: First, that in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vast majority of instances the results are very close when the averages for entire buildings are compared. In fifteen of the twenty-one schools on my list, the averages on the second test, as the table shows, run from 73.3 to 77.9. Second, while the results in the lower grades of different schools show considerable variation, those in the eighth-year classes, which represent the end of the school course, are remarkably even. In twelve of the seventeen eighth-year grades, the averages are from 84 to 88, the A and B classes being taken together. And in fifteen of a total of twenty sets of eighth-grade compositions examined for spelling, the variations were only three-tenths of 1 per cent, the results lying between 99.1 and 99.4, the A's and B's being taken as one. These facts are doubly remarkable when we consider that the twenty-one schools not only represent institutions in many sections of the country, but that they are samples of schools conducted under all conceivable conditions. For example, No. 7 is a Western city of moderate size; while No. 15 is a large city in the East. Again, most of the children attending School A, No. 7 are of American parentage, and their home surroundings are particularly favorable; while the children attending School B, No. 7 represent the foreign laboring element. Further, from a pedagogical standpoint, all varieties of schools are included; some of them belonging to the most mechanical, while others are among the most progressive in our country.

If the best results had been secured in the mechanical and the poorest in the progressive schools, the question would arise, whether the small additional return would warrant the latter in placing additional pressure on spelling at the expense of other subjects. But even this question does not arise; for it did not happen that the results in most cases were best in mechanical schools. Indeed, in both the mechanical and the progressive schools, the results were variable; so that while, in some instances, the higher figures were secured by the former, in others they were obtained by the latter; and the same is true of the lower figures. For example, School B, No. 11, in which the best average (79.4) was obtained, belongs to a very progressive system; while School A, No. 12, which made only 73.9, belongs to one of our most mechanical systems. And it is a peculiar incident that, in both these cities, the results in the only other school examined are exactly reversed, although the environment is about the same.

Further, just as it is impossible by the results to distinguish the mechanical from the progressive schools, so it is impossible to distinguish the schools attended by the children of cultured parents from those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

representing the foreign laboring element; the results from this standpoint also varying equally. Consequently, so far as spelling is concerned, the influence of environment, appears to be insignificant.

The second point to which I have referred; namely, the small variation in the eighth-year results,—regardless of how much time had been devoted to spelling, or what methods had been employed, or under what home influences the children had been reared,—is also well worthy of consideration. And it is no less striking that the same level was reached in the end, regardless of what had been accomplished in the lower grades,—a fact which becomes obvious on comparing the results in the eighth-year classes with the average obtained by the entire school. In the composition-test, where the results in fifteen of the twenty sets of eighth-year papers were within three-tenths of each other, this fact is still more clearly demonstrated. To make a further study of eighth-year results a few variations in the tests were tried; and no modifications were found. For example, in a special test of twenty-five very simple words, I examined four eighth-year classes representing three different cities. The extremes did not vary more than two points; the results being respectively 92.0, 93.2, 93.6, and 94.4. In one school, the compositions were written from the picture alone; so that the pupils were absolutely free in the selection of the story and the choice of words. The average was 99.3.

Do not these results indicate that, in learning to spell, maturity is the leading factor, while method plays only a subordinate part? And, if the superiority of the old-fashioned spelling grind cannot be demonstrated, is it not our duty to save the child from this grind? Moreover, as the results prove that, beyond a certain minimum, the compensation for time devoted to spelling is scarcely, if at all, appreciable, have we not here discovered an element of waste, which, if eliminated, would open the way to an equal enrichment of the course of study without detriment to the formal branches?

It might still be argued that while pressure could be omitted in the case of pupils who are likely to complete the grammar-school course, it would nevertheless be needed for those who cannot attend school longer than four or five years. But, in view of my results, this argument is equally controvertible. For, in the first place, while the fourth and fifth grades, individually considered, show considerable variation, we find many instances in which a low fourth-year average is followed by a high fifth-, and *vice versa;* so that when the two grades are averaged together, the results for the different schools are very close.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Again, while the differences in the fourth year are marked, the results do not speak in favor of mechanical primary schools. On the contrary, the poorest fourth-grade results—Schools A and B, No. 12—were obtained by the products of primary departments as mechanical as any to be found; while, on the other hand, among those who did best were the products of some of our most delightful primary schools, such as School A, No. 7, and School B, No. 11. That no dogmatic statements on this point can be made on either side, however, is proved by the fact that a contrary statement would be equally true; for in some of the mechanical schools the fourth-grade averages were high, while in some of the progressive schools they were comparatively low.

In the majority of instances, the results of the first test, also, were confined within narrow limits; for, in twelve out of eighteen cities—Nos. 1 and 9 being excluded—the averages ranged from 70.6 to 74.8, the number of correctly spelled words thus lying between 35 and 37. On the second test, the general averages in seven cities out of nine ranged from 73.5 to 76.8. The smallest variations, however, were found in the results of the composition-test, where, in spite of the great variation in the character of the institutions, the extreme difference in ten schools out of eleven was only five tenths of 1 per cent—98.2 to 98.7.

Finally, as in most localities the general results were nearly equal—those secured under the same system of instruction varying as much as those obtained under different systems—it is clear that the remedy does not lie in a change of method, nor in an increase of time. And this conclusion accords with the fact that the dissatisfaction with spelling is as great in communities where this subject constitutes a special feature as in those where spelling plays only a subordinate part in the schools.

Whether or not the spelling in a particular locality is actually below the average can be learned only by comparing the results of an examination conducted on the same basis in many localities. By examining children in any one city, on a set of arbitrarily selected words, the question cannot be solved, because the results in other places, on the same list of words, would remain an unknown quantity. A common standard is offered, however, by a composition-test such as I have undertaken. And when a test of this nature shows results similar to those presented in this article, interested citizens may rest assured that the spelling in their own schools is no worse than it is in those of most other localities.

J. M. Rice.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REMARKABLE SUCCESS OF WOMAN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT IN NEW ZEALAND.

THE agitation in favor of what are familiarly known as "Women's Rights" has now been going on for more than a quarter of a century with varying success in different parts of the world, but chiefly in the countries occupied by the English-speaking race. No movement has been advocated with more enthusiasm by those who have embraced its principles: few, if any, have been met with a more unsympathetic and dogged opposition by those who have rejected them. This was perhaps to have been expected to some extent, owing to the nature of the questions involved; but it may be worth while to inquire whether it has not been due, at least in part, to the methods generally adopted by its most earnest and energetic advocates. Should it appear that these are faulty, it is not yet too late to amend them. Should it be possible to produce evidence that other methods than those generally employed have proved more effective in any instance, it may at any rate be worthy of inquiry what these methods have been, and why they have been crowned with a success which, it must be admitted, has not hitherto been very general in civilized communities.

The history of social development in all ages presents a picture of gradual, frequently of almost unnoticed, concessions by the strong to the weak—by those possessed of the good things of existence to those who have sought to share them—rather than of great victories won, and great advantages forcibly wrested by the one class from the other. It would be an endless task to trace the steps by which nearly every far-reaching and beneficent reform in social life has been attained; indeed, generally it would be impossible, owing to the fact that formal demands were not made, nor a formal programme blazoned on the banner of the party of progress. It may be granted that in many respects times have altered, and that the present, more than any former time, is a period of programmes and blazonry; but it by no means follows that it is on that account necessarily superior to the times that have preceded it, even in the effectiveness of its methods. In spite of all the changes that have come about during the century now drawing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to its close, it has yet to be proved that human nature has undergone any material alteration; and one of the best ascertained and most widespread characteristics of human nature has always been its reluctance to accede to demands even where it could easily be approached and managed by less ostentatious methods. It may well be so in the case of the great social and political revolution of our own day; and it is far from unlikely that the progress of the movement for securing what are known as "Women's Rights" in matters political would be greatly accelerated if many of its advocates could be contented to ask rather than to demand, to persuade rather than to denounce those who as yet remain unconvinced.

Men may listen much and do little; and it would seem that that is very much the position at which the "Women's Rights" movement has halted in most parts of the civilized world to-day. Where the point at issue is a great and practical one, it is not enough to get men to listen to arguments, either from the platform or the press. It is not enough to organize companies of enthusiastic women to carry—perhaps even to flaunt—the banner of their political creed in the face of unbelieving mankind. Two things, it may be asserted, are necessary to render victory widely possible: (1) the practical instincts of men must be satisfied by having it demonstrated that the proposed changes will work well in practice; and (2) the great mass of women must be taught to interest themselves in the movement as one which is to be of practical and not merely of theoretical value to themselves.

It is a fact which can hardly be too strongly insisted on, that only a very small minority of human beings—whether male or female—is greatly interested in pure theories. The few indeed, can grow enthusiastic upon abstract questions of right, and indignant about abstract wrongs; but, although it may be contended that they are the salt of the earth and of society, they are not, it must be admitted, a very influential or popular condiment. The vast majority want to know what is to be gained by practically recognizing the right demanded, or by remedying the wrong complained of. For them, things as they are have at any rate the authority of experience in their favor. If the world seems on the whole to be a pretty good world,—as it undoubtedly is,—in spite of a few drawbacks, most men, and a large majority of women also, want something more than an argument upon abstract principles and the eternal fitness of things to render them willing to accept what looks like a sweeping innovation. It may be feared that this fact has been too little considered by the advocates of women's rights.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They have confined themselves generally to arguments founded on the equality in intellect which exists—or at least is said to exist—between the sexes, and to the superiority which is claimed for women in all that pertains to the finer sentiments and moral convictions of human nature; and having, as they consider, triumphantly demonstrated these things, they are too apt to pause for the assent of men to their conclusions that, consequently, women should vote at elections, sit as Senators, and occupy the Presidential chair. They are astonished that this assent is so slow in coming, and are only too ready to attribute the delay to selfishness and the tyranny of the strong over the weak, blended with a little uneasiness at the prospect of losing that position of preëminence which men have usurped so long.

Men, on the other hand, so far as they have taken an interest in the matter at all, have generally troubled themselves little about questions of abstract right. The problem has presented itself to them usually as a practical one; and its commonest form may be taken to be, "How will this proposed overturn of existing arrangements affect my family? Will my home-life be as safe and as harmonious when my wife talks and lives politics as it is now? Will my daughters be as safe from undesirable associations and situations as I am able to keep them at present? And furthermore, will it do any good? Will politics really become purer because a new half of the population has suddenly been taken into active partnership in their management,—the half which up to this time has taken no interest worth mentioning in the matter?"

These will no doubt appear trivial objections to the enthusiasts in the cause. They are at all times prepared with the high-sounding motto, "Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum"; and, having fully convinced themselves that theirs is the cause of justice, they are more than ready to ignore the questionings of doubt and the hesitations of prudence. It is probably not wholly unfortunate that the matter does not rest with them. They, however, have to face the situation and acknowledge that, as things stand, the task before them is not to convince themselves, but the men of the community. To do this they must condescend to ordinary methods. They must convince men that the proposed change will be for the better; they must remove from men's minds the idea that it is a mere fad, the creature of a handful of enthusiastic and not very wise nor well-balanced women; they must furnish men with some practical grounds for believing that to give the women of the community votes and admission to public life will result

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in positive benefit to politics, and will not tend to destroy the life of the home and the happiness of the family. Until this is done there is every prospect that the progress of the great proposed reform will be slow;—indeed, in many countries there is even a risk that a reaction may set in and that the movement may collapse altogether.

As a single object-lesson is often worth a dozen lectures, it is fortunate for the cause of woman's political enfranchisement that it is now possible to study in several parts of the world the operation of a system by which both sexes are placed on something like an equality in political privileges, and—which is perhaps even more likely to be of practical use to the cause—to trace the steps by which this change has been brought about, and the results which appear to have followed its introduction. I propose to state here, as a contribution to the fuller understanding of this important question, the history and results of woman's franchise legislation in the self-governing colony of New Zealand. In doing so I may call attention to the fact that the country referred to has special claims to attention owing to the fact that it is a comparatively small and compact country, inhabited by a community of almost unmixed British, and particularly English, origin, widely separated from any other community, and generally possessed of a high standard of culture and education. As a consequence, it may be, of these peculiarities, the colonists of New Zealand have been remarkable among the communities of Australasia for the number of their new departures both in their legislation and institutions. Thus it was in New Zealand that the system now known as the Australian ballot had its origin; and it is there that it is found to-day in its most complete form. It was there that a system of perpetually leasing instead of selling state lands was introduced; and the system is now in practical working. There, also, a complete system of local option in the sale of intoxicating drinks has for many years been in operation.

It is now four years since the electoral franchise was granted by act of the local parliament to all women twenty-one years of age; and, as the parliaments in New Zealand last for three years, there have been two general elections in which the women's vote has been a most important factor. It is only just to note that there are no symptoms of public regret at the step thus taken, nor are there, so far, any indications of the change having altered in other respects the ordinary usages of society. On the other hand it is important to observe that the change was no new idea in New Zealand. It was not the result of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

female agitation, either through the press or on the platform. There were no "Women's Rights" leagues organized; nor was any public attempt made to denounce the selfishness of men, or to magnify the virtues and intellectual powers of women. To the persons who have put themselves forward in positions of prominence in the "Women's Rights" movements in America and Great Britain the attitude of the women of New Zealand would undoubtedly have seemed slow and supine to an extraordinary degree. They held no meetings; they sent no petitions; they published no letters or pamphlets—either to denounce men or to praise women. What they did was to take advantage of every opportunity that was given them of taking part in the management of public affairs, and of showing an active and intelligent interest in public questions.

It was in the year 1877 that the first step was taken by the legislature, which has found its natural result in the full enfranchisement of the women of the colony. In that year the Parliament enacted the first general education law for the country; and by that act the women—or rather, to speak more correctly, a small section of the women of the country—were granted their first share in the management of public affairs. By that act the country was divided, for educational purposes, into six provinces, and the entire control of the schools—subject only to the provisions of the law—was vested in an elective Education Board for each province. These Boards had the spending of all the money voted by Parliament for educational purposes, divided among the provinces on the basis of population; they had the appointment of all officers and teachers within their own districts, and the erection and maintenance of all school buildings; so that their powers and patronage were large. The members were elected annually by the votes of the committees of the school districts throughout their provinces; and these school committees were in turn elected every year by the resident heads of families in each school district. Thus a school district might contain two or three schools in a country district, where the population was scattered, and half a dozen, or even more, in a town, where it was more concentrated; and it was the duty of the resident heads of families living within it to elect seven of their number each year to exercise a local oversight of the schools, in accordance with the regulations laid down by the Board of the province.

It was found that no class of the inhabitants took a more active and intelligent interest in the proper management of the schools than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the women who chanced, either from widowhood, or the absence of their husbands from home, to be in the position to vote for members of the school committees. At first they confined themselves to attending the meetings and there taking part in the election of the committees; but within a year or two the interest which they took in the subject led to their being gradually elected as members of the committees themselves. Until within a very few years, it was the exception rather than the rule to find a school committee on which there was not at least one female member. It is worthy of note that the tribute was entirely a voluntary one on the part of the male householders; and, so far as is recorded, there was no attempt made to agitate for the election of committee-women. Women are equally eligible for election on the provincial Boards of Education; but I am not aware that any woman has been elected to the position. This is probably owing to the fact that the constituency, embracing as it does all the school committees of a province, is more easily approached by well-known men than by any member of the other sex.

Five years after the establishment of the national system of education a complete revision of the licensing law of the colony took place; and it was determined to place the issue of licenses entirely under popular control within each electoral district of the country. A local board was provided for, the members of which were to be elected once in two years by the votes of all the ratepayers in each district, with whom it should rest whether any, and, if any, how many, licenses to sell intoxicating liquors should be granted in each year. The original proposal was that the right of electing members of Licensing Boards should vest in the male ratepayers only; but, after discussion, the principle which had already been found to work so successfully in the case of the Education Boards was extended to that of Licensing Boards throughout the colony. Since the year 1883, therefore, all female ratepayers have been in a position to exercise the franchise with respect to the liquor traffic as fully as the other sex. It was feared at the time that the result would be to strengthen the hands of the total abstainers, by the election of men wedded to the idea of closing all licensed houses; but experience failed to justify the expectation. From the first the Licensing Boards have been remarkable for their moderation; sternly repressing all inferior or doubtfully conducted houses,—there are no saloons, or mere liquor shops, recognized by the New Zealand law,—but in no single instance attempting to deprive any populous district of hotel accommodation altogether. These elections, being conducted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in all respects like elections for members of the legislature, enabled the public to judge how far the fears of those who dreaded unpleasantness as the result of male and female voters attending the same polling-booths were well founded. It was shown that all such fears were groundless, and that the result appeared rather to be a marked improvement in the orderliness of the proceedings.

Encouraged by the excellent results following the gradual extension of the right of voting to women, the next step was to admit all female ratepayers to an equal voice with the men in municipal elections throughout the colony. So complete had been the success attending the female franchise as applied to Licensing Boards, that the new proposal was adopted with scarcely a show of opposition; and the grant of the privilege was followed not only by its general exercise by all female ratepayers, but by a very decided improvement both in the class of men elected and in the general orderliness and quietness of the proceedings. In this way public opinion in New Zealand advanced step by step, uninfluenced by declamation, or arguments based upon theories which must, in their very nature, be open to question, but moulded gradually by the results of experience, and feeling its way by practical methods to a practical result. From first to last it may be said to have been the doing of the women of the colony themselves, who quietly accepted the power placed in their hands and used it so intelligently as to impress the other sex with the conviction that its possession did the women no injury, while it had a decidedly beneficial effect upon the conduct of public affairs.

It was under these circumstances that the proposal was finally made to confer the full electoral franchise upon all persons of full age, without regard to sex. It was really a foregone conclusion, because every one of the natural objections to the change had been gradually undermined in advance. It had become useless to allege that women knew nothing of such matters, and would not take any interest in learning, in a community where for sixteen years the women had been showing an ever-increasing interest of the most intelligent kind in each question that was successively placed within their control. It was felt that if the wives and daughters of the colonists could without injury or annoyance vote at municipal elections, and elect men in whose hands should vest discretionary power on such questions as the granting of licenses to retail liquor, they could certainly take part in a parliamentary election, where local feeling was likely to be less acute. Finally, no real attempt was made to exhibit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the cherished bogey of those opposed to female suffrage which draws its terrors from pictures of homes divided by differences of political opinion and of husbands and wives quarrelling over the ballot-box. There was really no weapon left in the armory of the opponents of a revolution which had been preparing during sixteen years.

By the same statute which granted the franchise to women it was provided that the registrars should expunge from the electoral rolls after every election the names of all persons who, according to the certified copy of the electoral roll of their districts supplied by the returning officer at each election, had failed to register their votes. It was thus cast upon each elector either to appear and excuse, to the satisfaction of the court of revision, his failure to perform the duty of giving his vote or to suffer the loss of his franchise at the succeeding election. It may be in consequence of this provision, that the proportion of votes recorded to the number of qualified electors on the roll is an unusually high one; and the results of the two general elections which have taken place since the franchise was extended to women show that the female voters of New Zealand have exercised their newly acquired right in as nearly as possible the same proportion as the men. At no time have more important questions been agitated in the colony, and at none does there seem to have been a more general interest taken in the result of the elections; yet it is reported that there has been a marked and increasing improvement in the proceedings of all kinds, from the public meetings and platform speeches to the quiet and orderly conduct of the voters on election day. There have been a few women's political clubs started and organized; but as a rule the idea of separate action has met with little favor; and the female voters of New Zealand have been content to take an intelligent but unostentatious share in the ordinary political movements of the party to which they have been attached. Political meetings in New Zealand are no longer assemblies of men alone, but are largely attended by women also; and it is said that the change has led to a great improvement both in the character of the proceedings and in the oratory. As yet, female speakers on public platforms would seem to be rare; and at the late elections they appear in almost every case to have belonged to the extreme temperance or anti-liquor-traffic party. The innovation does not indeed seem to be a popular one in the colony; and its strongest opponents are said to be the mass of the female voters themselves; but it is not reported that women have ever been refused a fair hearing, especially by the male part of their audience.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Something remains to be said as to the results of the change on the personnel of the parliamentary candidates elected, and on the policy which has received the popular support. It is to be noted that the alteration in the law added, within 3 per cent, a number of new voters equal to those already upon the electoral rolls; and had it been the case, as was expected by many, that on political questions women would take an essentially different view from that held by men, the result could hardly have failed to be as startling as alarmists had prophesied. As a matter of fact no such results have followed at either of the elections, which have taken place with an interval of three years between them. At both elections—and markedly so at the last, which took place a few months ago—candidates were favored whose personal character stood high and whose political record was irreproachable. Ability, even where it was well known and had long been publicly recognized, failed in many cases to secure election where personal character was questionable; men new to politics, but credited by the public with honesty and good character, were again and again victorious over others who were not only better known, but presumably far more able; finally, party distinctions seem, to a considerable extent, to have lost their hold upon the voters, who, in not a few cases, appear to have preferred to trust a candidate ranged on the less popular side rather than vote for a partisan in whose character they had no confidence. Such would seem to be the results, so far as candidates in New Zealand are concerned; and they are universally attributed to the influence of the female vote. This experience has been summed up in the statement that, in New Zealand at any rate, female electors think more of men and less of questions than male voters do.

It cannot be denied that the results, so far, have been a great surprise and disappointment to some extreme classes of politicians in New Zealand. It was confidently expected that the first consequence of granting the franchise to women would be an overwhelming strengthening of the anti-liquor party. At the first elections held after the new law took effect there was an increase in the temperance vote large enough to encourage the party to believe that it only needed sufficient breathing-space, during which the female voter might grow accustomed to her new powers and have an opportunity of considering the arguments of the party, to lead to an overwhelming vote in favor of prohibition,—or at least of a law leading directly to prohibition. Such a law was proposed and rejected by the last parliament, although it had a majority in the House of Representatives, as the more popular cham-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber is called in New Zealand; and the question became a leading one at the elections just completed. The result has been a blow to the anti-liquor cause. Throughout the country the extreme measure has been discredited; and in a great many cases its advocates were rejected in favor of candidates who maintained that the power of local control, by which any district could practically prevent licenses being granted within its own boundaries, was sufficient. On the whole it would seem that the introduction of the female vote in the colony has had very little effect upon general politics. The party in power when the change was made continue in power still, but with a considerably smaller majority. Extreme change of every sort appears to be objected to; and yet no alteration is manifested in the general trend of political feeling throughout the country. The parliament has lost some well-known figures, but scarcely any who were not open to suspicion on grounds of character; and parties appear to be more evenly balanced to-day than at any previous period during the last ten years.

The example of New Zealand should be of advantage to the cause in many ways, but in none so much as this: that it teaches not only how men can be induced to consent to women taking an equal share in the government and law-making which is to affect themselves and their children, but also how women may fit themselves to discharge well the new powers thus acquired. The case of New Zealand is no example of the advantages that might flow from granting the franchise, merely on grounds of natural right, to a female population unprepared by education and practical training to use the privilege and exercise their new duties well. To tell the truth, that was an argument which might have been sought in vain in the records of the New Zealand parliament at any one of the stages of the political emancipation of women in that country. It was, in the first place, because women were sure to take an interest in the state of the schools to which they sent their children that they were allowed a voice in the election of the school committees. It was because they had shown themselves capable of doing this work well, and even more anxious than men to give it their intelligent attention, that it was thought wise to let them exercise a vote in the regulation of the liquor traffic. It was only when experience had shown that they were second to none in their efficient and moderate performance of this duty that they were admitted freely to take a full share, as voters, councillors, and even as chief executive officers, in the management of municipal affairs. Finally, it was the fact that experience had proved women capable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not merely of taking part in, but of improving the management of, local affairs which led to the grant to them of the full electoral franchise in New Zealand.

It may be said that, after all, the case of the women of New Zealand only proves the arguments true which the advocates of "Women's Rights" have so long been using. It may be maintained that, if all the women of America were granted the franchise, the results would vindicate the policy. It may be so; but the case of the political emancipation of women in New Zealand affords no proof that such would be the case. There her emancipation was founded not on theory, but on experience. It was not taken for granted that she was in all respects the equal of man, and that, therefore, she must be able to do efficiently at once all that man had taken centuries to learn to do. Above all it was not supposed that interest in, and a reasonably sufficient knowledge of, political affairs came to women any more than it did to men, by the gift of nature. There may be other methods of arriving at the results attained by the women of New Zealand which may be safely tried in other countries; but the experience of that colony is certainly no argument in their favor.

One step remains which has not yet been taken in New Zealand, and there is as yet no sign of its being demanded in that country. While women enjoy the full electoral franchise, they are not yet capable, according to law, of being themselves elected to seats in Parliament. No doubt there is something of a want of logic in this lingering disability of the sex; and yet it may be said to be characteristic of the methods hitherto pursued in that colony with so much success. That the right to sit in Parliament, as well as to vote for men to do so, will ere long be extended to women in New Zealand, there is no room to doubt: indeed it must come as soon as the female voters of the country desire it. As yet they have shown no wish to possess this privilege, but have contented themselves with the exercise of the powers they already possess. In this moderation they are probably as wise as they have shown themselves from the first; and it may be confidently predicted that in New Zealand the proposal to remove the last political distinction between the sexes will come from the men,—convinced that by such a reform they will add to the dignity of their parliament and the purity and wisdom of their executive.

HUGH H. LUSK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME OPENED TOMBS AND THEIR OCCUPANTS.

WERE I to attempt any full enumeration of the tombs of the illustrious dead which have been opened, and even rifled, by the irreverent and reprehensible, yet not wholly unnatural, curiosity of later generations, I should require the space of a volume rather than of an article. Yet it may not, I think, be uninteresting to the readers of THE FORUM to refer to a few memorable instances in which the peace of the grave has been thus invaded.

Of the three greatest poets of the Christian world—Dante, Shakespeare, and Milton—Shakespeare alone has escaped the indignity of disinterment. This is due, beyond all doubt, to the energetic warning and curse which, with prophetic insight, he recorded on his tombstone :—

> "Good frend, for Jesus sake, forbeare
> To digg the dust encloased here :
> Blest be ye man that spares these stones,
> And curst be he that moves my bones."

The temptation to try and look once more on the dead lineaments of that immortal countenance has, I believe, been at times very strong. It has been resisted only because no one cared to incur the anathema which the poet pronounced against anyone who should dare to violate his earthly rest by tampering with his mortal remains.

But Dante has not escaped. He was buried at San Francesco in Ravenna; but, on the expulsion from Ravenna of his patron, Guido Novello da Polenta, his remains "were with difficulty protected from the persecution of the Florentines and the excommunication of the Pope." The Cardinal Legate of Pope John XXII ordered Dante's bones to be burnt, together with his treatise "De Monarchia." In 1483, the Podestà of Ravenna built a mausoleum for them, which was rebuilt by Cardinal Valenti Gonzaga in 1780. But in 1865, on the sexcentenary of Dante's birth, the suspicion was verified that the body of the poet was no longer in the mausoleum; and in repairing an old chapel in the Church of San Francesco a wooden box was discovered, containing a perfect skeleton of a man of Dante's age and stature, with an inscrip-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion on it, in which Fra Antonio de Santi says that he had removed the body thither in 1677. Only a few small bones were found in the mausoleum. The skeleton was transferred to Lombardo's urn in the mausoleum; and Fra Antonio's object in removing it may have been to prevent the depredation of such sacred relics.

And Milton has not escaped. In his early Latin poem he had anticipated that he would one day wear the Parnassian laurel; and added: "Ast ego . . . secura pace quiescam." The first part of his youthful prophecy was amply fulfilled; not, alas! the second. Dr. Garth complained that "E'en churches are no sanctuaries now"; and the complaint is emphasized by what befell the remains of the great Puritan. He was buried in St. Giles's, Cripplegate, on November 12, 1674; and for one hundred and nineteen years,—until 1793—no monument was raised over his grave, and the exact spot of his interment was forgotten.

But in 1790, search was made; and on August 3 it was announced that his coffin had been found. The church authorities rightly "disdained to disturb the sacred ashes." But that night a publican, a pawnbroker, a surgeon, and a coffin-maker got into the church and opened the leaden shell. The publican "pulled hard at the teeth" and at last got one knocked out by a stone! These body-snatchers felt strongly inclined to steal the whole lower jaw; and, after pawing and handling the hallowed remains, these sacrilegious wretches tore out some of the hair and stole some of the bones. As recently as 1852, a writer in "Notes and Queries" says: "I have handled one of Milton's ribs." Well might the poet Cowper protest against these grewsome and indecent familiarities committed by ignorant and graceless boors!

The relic-hunting superstition, which came on the Church like a flood in the fourth century, caused the violation of the tombs of multitudes of saints and great ecclesiastics, and from the first opened the way for boundless imposture. That, however, is a branch of the subject on which I shall not here touch. I will confine myself to England, and will allude only to English kings; though, if space permitted, I should have some interesting tales to tell about the resting-places of English primates.

The "strange stories of the deaths of kings," and the desire to find some historic verification or confutation of them, are partly accountable for the opening of some of our royal coffins. But mere stark antiquarianism and blind love of relics have something to answer for.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a cantata by Dr. Burney, three antiquaries appear in character and sing:

1st Antiquary:
"But where so long did linger
These relics rare and rum?"

2d Antiquary:
"I filched the monarch's finger."

3d Antiquary:
"I stole the monarch's thumb."

The body of Edward the Confessor has twice been seen since his interment on January 6, 1066. His coffin was opened in the reign of Henry II, after the king had, at Becket's instigation, procured his canonization by Pope Alexander III. On that occasion, on October 13, 1163, Becket and the mitred Abbot Lawrence saw the face and long white down-curling beard of the king. They took out his splendid robes and made three capes of them. Once more, on October 13, 1269, the saint's body was removed by Henry III from its original grave under the lantern of Westminster Abbey, before the high altar, to the once-gorgeous shrine which they now occupy. On this occasion the king took out of the coffin the famous ring which the Confessor is said to have given to a beggar who turned out to be St. John the Evangelist in disguise. According to one account Henry II was the depredator of the ring. This ring (says the legend) St. John, *in propria persona*, returned to two Ludlow pilgrims in Palestine, bidding them take it back to the royal saint with an injunction to hasten the completion of the Abbey, because his death was near at hand. These three scenes—the bestowal of the ring upon the apparent beggar, his appearance to the pilgrims, and their return to the king—are all carved, with much vivid expression, over the interesting screen in the Confessor's Chapel. In the second scene, St. John is a colossal figure. In the third scene, the two pilgrims, with their staves, are kneeling before the banquet-table, at which the king is seated in his crown, with Archbishop Stigand at his right. The palace in Essex, where this is supposed to have occurred, received the name of Havering atte Bower.

The coffin was once more rifled by King James II; but the disturbance of the saintly relics on this occasion was accidental. In the preparations for James's consecration the Confessor's Chapel had been boarded over, in order that seats might be placed at its summit for the Members of the House of Commons. In removing this temporary structure a plank fell down and broke open the coffin of St. Edward.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The antiquary Harding, who happened to be present, put in his hand and took out a large gilt cross which lay on the saint's breast. This cross was given to James II, and has finally disappeared. No one knows what has become of it; but it has been conjectured that, when James attempted his escape from Faversham, and was stopped and roughly handled by the fishermen, the cross may have been torn from him. At any rate, since his days it has been heard of no more, though now and then some old gilt cross turns up which purports to be the lost relic—but fails to gain the sanction of professional archæologists.

The bones of William the Conqueror lie undisturbed at Caen, in St. Stephen's Abbey. William Rufus, when he had been fatally wounded by the arrow of Wat Tyrrell in the New Forest, fell dead from his horse. His body was carried in a common cart by two rustics to Winchester; and the fall of the Cathedral tower soon afterward was regarded as a judgment on the building which enshrined the wicked "Red King." His coffin was opened in 1868, and even then it became clear that the bones had been previously disturbed; for they lay in a promiscuous heap. The corpse had been clad in a red cloak embroidered with gold; and with it lay the fragment of an arrow and a massive uncut turquoise. It is said that the Puritans had previously rifled the tomb and taken from it a gold ring and a chalice. This is, however, very doubtful; for chalices were buried only with great ecclesiastics.

Henry II was buried at Fontevrault; and his son, Richard I, was laid at his feet. Their remains, like those of other royal personages buried there, are said to have been scattered to the winds by anarchic mobs during the French Revolution. The tombs, though much injured, are still beautiful.

When Edward I died, he left instructions that his bones were to be *boiled*, and yearly to be carried by his army to the invasion of Scotland. These instructions were probably ignored; for, when his tomb was opened by the Society of Antiquaries in 1771, those present gazed for a moment on the features of the great victor before they sank into dust. The gold cloth was still folded round the colossal corpse; and the cast in the eyes was distinctly noticeable. The snow-white hair still remained. The coffin was then filled with pitch. So far as I know, the tomb of Edward III at Westminster has never been opened, nor that of his famous son, the Black Prince, at Canterbury. But the remains of Richard II underwent various vicissitudes. As there were dark rumors on the one hand about his murder, on the other about his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supposed escape from prison, and as these rumors disturbed the House of Lancaster, Henry IV had Richard's body dug up from its resting-place in Pomfret Castle, and carried, with the face exposed, to Langley, to prove to the people that their former king was really dead. In the days of Henry V, the remains were again disinterred and carried to the royal tomb in Westminster, where the unhappy monarch—if indeed it be he—lies by the side of his first wife, Anne of Bohemia. His tomb was accidentally opened in the last century, and the bones and skulls were seen and examined; but the doubts which existed were not thereby set at rest. The universal rumor about the murder of Richard II—a rumor which found a place in history—said that his skull had been broken by a blow of the battle-axe of Sir Piers Exton, who, while the king was bravely defending himself against those who assailed him in front, got upon a bench and brained him from behind. If that story be true, the skeleton in the royal tomb is not that of Richard II, for the skull of it was found to be entirely uninjured. There were, however, two legends about the deposed Richard,—one, that the body which was carried on a bier to London, with the face uncovered in order that all men might recognize it, was after all *not* the body of the king at all, but that of his chaplain Maudlin, or Maudsley, who closely resembled him; the other, that the story of his murder was a pure invention, that he had been suffered to make his escape to Scotland, and that there he died in peaceful obscurity at Perth, where legends still speak of him as "the Mammet King."

King Henry IV was buried, in 1413, by his own direction, in Canterbury Cathedral, though he died in the Jerusalem Chamber in Westminster Abbey. The tomb was opened in 1832, to set at rest a historic doubt. The Yorkists, who hated the Lancastrian usurper, asserted that his body did not rest in the tomb at all; but that when he died his body had been thrown into the Thames, between Barking and Gravesend, during a terrific storm which instantly ceased when the coffin was thrown out of the boat. Strangely circumstantial as the story is, it is an absolute fiction. When the coffin in the chantry of Henry IV in Canterbury Cathedral was opened, there the king's body lay; and, for the few seconds before the prominent features collapsed, the few who were present saw "the cankered Bolingbroke" as he looked in life,—or rather as he looked in death after that memorable scene in the Jerusalem Chamber, which Shakespeare has so pathetically described. The face was in complete preservation; and all the teeth but one were perfect.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His warrior-son, the hero of Agincourt, perhaps the most popular of all English sovereigns before the present reign, rests at peace in the stately tomb erected for him by his wife, Katherine of Valois. It is true that the silver head of his effigy and the silver plates which covered its heart of oak were stolen from the great Abbey as far back as the reign of Queen Elizabeth; but the tomb itself has never been disturbed. It has been far otherwise with his consort, the daughter of Charles VI of France, whom, on her arrival in England, the chroniclers describe as having been as "beautiful as an angel of God." Either in repentance for her wilful disobedience to her husband, in going to Windsor for the birth of her son, Henry VI, in spite of the prophecy—which turned out to be true—that "Henry of Windsor should lose what Harry of Monmouth had won," or else in remorse for the monstrous *mésalliance* of which she was guilty when she married the Welsh yeoman of the guard, Owen Tudor, she ordered that her coffin should be "meanly apparelled" and placed in the Lady Chapel. Her grandson, Henry VII, laid it beside that of her first royal and victorious husband. The coffin, therefore, was a poor and common one. In the course of years it had more or less mouldered away; and her skull was visible, covered with skin which looked like a thin yellow parchment. Samuel Pepys tells us that he went into the Abbey on his birthday (February 24, 1668) in the reign of Charles II, and kissed the skull; and he glories in the fact that, on that occasion, "he had kissed a queen." This state of things became more and more scandalous; and at last the dean and chapter, some century ago, ordered that a new coffin should be made and that the queen's body should be removed. It was most incongruously thrust into the vault of Sir George Villiers, the Buckinghamshire knight whose ghost appeared to his son, the Duke of Buckingham, in the reign of Charles I to warn him of his approaching murder. Not many years ago, when Dr. Stanley was Dean of Westminster, the Percy vault, which communicates with the Villiers vault, was opened for a funeral; and Dean Stanley thought this a good opportunity to see if the Queen's coffin was secure. Mr. Wright, the clerk of the works, went through the aperture, found the coffin with Katherine's name on it, and, by the Dean's order, it was brought out to us. It had long been in a damp place; and it had no sooner been lifted out of the dark vault into the chapel above, than it fell to pieces, and the body of the queen of Henry V lay before us. I say "the body," for there were still some skin and some tendons on parts of it; but it was mainly a skeleton, and its enfolding cerements had crumbled into dust. Nothing else was in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the coffin except some fragments of cere-cloth and remains of the silk cushion on which the head had rested. A small piece of this was cut off as a relic for one who had a right to ask for it; otherwise, nothing whatever was touched or disturbed. No one but myself was permitted to see the remains, except the late Sir George Scharf, and, I think, one of the canons. The clerk of the works was ordered immediately to make a solid oak coffin; the body was reverently deposited within it, and was then reinterred under what had been the altar of the chantry which she herself had caused to be erected above the tomb of her husband, and immediately beneath his helmet, shield, and saddlebow, which are fastened to a beam between the two great columns. The Dean wrote an appropriate Latin inscription; and so, for the first time after some two hundred years, the mortal spoils of the daughter, wife, and mother of French and English kings—who with her husband had been crowned at Paris—found there a fitting resting-place, perhaps for ages to come.

There is a dim tradition that, much more than a century ago, the tomb under which the two sister-queens—Mary, the Roman Catholic, and Elizabeth, the Protestant, *regno consortes et urna*—lie side by side had fallen into disrepair, and that a bold Westminster boy crept into the hollow vault, and, through an aperture in the coffin, laid his hand on the heart of the mighty Tudor queen. Passing over this incident, I will only mention the discovery of the body of Charles I, when George IV was Prince Regent. It has been asserted, and is I believe true, that the nation wished the body of him whom they always called "the saint and martyr" to be removed from Windsor and buried in Westminster Abbey; and that a sum of no less than £70,000 was entrusted by Parliament to Charles II to erect a tomb over the remains of his father. If the story be true, the entire sum disappeared and was not put to the intended purpose. It was however supposed that the "White King's" *coffin*, at any rate, had been transferred to the Abbey. It was in order to settle a doubt on this point that George IV, then Prince Regent, went down into the vaults of Windsor with the famous physician, Sir Henry Halford. There they found the coffins of Henry VIII and of his wife, Lady Jane Seymour; and between them lay a coffin on which were rudely scratched the letters "C. I." In order to be sure that this was indeed the coffin of the executed king, they opened it—and there lay before them the handsome face, just as Vandyke depicted it; though (as always happens in such cases) the nose fell in immediately that the corpse was exposed to the open air. Then—I simply tell the tale as it was told to me; for, though there must be some

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

printed accounts of the event, I have never seen them—Sir Henry Halford took up by the hair the decapitated head, and placed it on the palm of his hand, which was covered by his silk handkerchief. When he replaced the head in the coffin the vertebra of the neck, which had been smoothly severed by the axe of the executioner, was lying on his handkerchief; and the Prince Regent remarked to Sir Henry that this would be an interesting relic for him. He took it; and had it set in gold with the inscription, "Os Caroli Primi, heu intercisum." I believe that, by the wish and right-feeling of H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, this relic of the hapless king has been replaced in the coffin. Everyone will recall the sanguinary epigram of Lord Byron upon the incident which I have narrated.

It must not be supposed from the instances which I have given that royal tombs in Westminster Abbey and other cathedrals are peculiarly liable to be disturbed by irreverent curiosity. For one coffin that has thus been opened there are hundreds which have not been touched.

Vaults may be opened for some important end; but the actual disturbance of the relics of the dead, and the stealing of these relics, has on the whole been the exception. During the restoration of my church, St. Margaret's, Westminster, I could have had a splendid opportunity of opening the coffins of William Caxton, the first English printer, and of Sir Walter Raleigh, "the father of the United States," as during the repairs, the vault containing their mortal remains was exposed to view; but even the chance of deciding the uncertainty about Sir Walter's decapitated head—which, some say, his son buried in St. Margaret's—did not tempt. Of all the dead, I say: "Let reverence triumph over curiosity. *Requiescant in pace!*"

F. W. Farrar.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FUR SEAL AS AN ANIMAL.

THE regulations adopted by the Paris Tribunal of Arbitration in 1893 for "the protection and preservation of the fur seal" have signally failed of their object. This failure is chiefly due to the treatment of the creature as an object of international litigation, not as an animal having habits and prejudices to which international statutes must conform if they are to serve any purpose. In the compromise adopted by the Tribunal were embodied certain propositions, apparently fair from the legal side of the case, but wholly repugnant to the animal. As the only possible basis for a final arrangement for the protection and preservation of the fur seal must conform perfectly to its habits, we may profitably consider the habits of the animal in some detail. That such a settlement must finally be made admits of no doubt. It is not to be supposed for a moment that England, Russia, and the United States will fail to settle so simple a problem, or that these great nations are so weak or so barbarous as to allow this wonderful animal to be wasted without mercy, when the conditions of its preservation are fully understood. To balance land killing against sea killing, to kill with guns in one sea and with spears in another, to kill on land in July and at sea in April and August, to have a closed zone of sixty miles and an open zone of two hundred,—all these compromises are ingenious on paper, and find their precedent in the checks and balances of constitutional law, but not in the facts of natural history. How such regulations affect the animal is not to be settled by compromise. It is a question of fact; and any system of regulations must be judged from the standpoint of the animal itself. The whole Bering Sea dispute belongs primarily to natural history, not to international law. If existing forms of international law fail to protect a noble and valuable animal in its migrations or its feeding excursions at sea, then more international law must be written; and the actual habits of the animal must determine the nature of such law.

The "fur seal" or "sea-bear," known to science as *Callorhinus ursinus*, inhabits certain islands in Bering and Okhotsk Seas, unknown

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to aboriginal man, and, so far as we are aware, never visited by man before the discovery of Bering and Medni Islands by Vitus Bering in 1741, and of St. George Island by Gerassim Pribilof in 1786. The species form three distinct herds, which must be recognized as three distinct species, each type being distinguishable from the others by several characters of importance. The most important of the three herds is the American or Pribilof herd, living on the two islands of the Pribilof group—St. George and St. Paul. Next in importance comes the Russian herd of the Komandorski or Commander Islands, Bering and Medni. The third herd is that of the Okhotsk Sea, inhabiting Robben Island, where a remnant of a few hundred still remains, and formerly also having rookeries on four islands of the Kuril group —Musir, Raikoke, Srednoi, and Broughton.

The American herd is present at its home on the Pribilof Islands from May until December, the seals going out at intervals to feed over a radius of about two hundred miles. In November and December they are driven away from the Islands by the winter storms, going southward in the open sea as far as the latitude of San Francisco, returning northward near the coast of the United States, British Columbia, and Alaska. They are not known to come on land anywhere except on the Pribilof Islands. In like manner the Commander Islands herd moves southward in winter, along the east coast of Japan; and the herd from Robben Island passes from the Okhotsk Sea along the west coast in the inland Sea of Japan.

The fur seals of the different herds do not intermingle on their migrations, and probably not on their summer feeding-grounds. The fables of the colonization of the Commander Islands by fur seals from the Pribilofs at some comparatively recent date have no basis in knowledge. Each adult seal returns year after year, not merely to the same island, but as nearly as may be to the same spot. With the younger seals this return as to exact place is doubtless less certain. But it is more than likely that the young of both sexes return to their home rookery; the one- and two-year-old females coming to the breeding-grounds late in the season, and the males taking up their places among the older bachelors on the adjoining "hauling-grounds."

The eccentricities of the nomenclature of the fur seal have been frequently noted. It seems, for example, incongruous that a "bull" and a "cow" should occupy a "harem" on a "rookery" and bear a "pup," which, if a male, is a "bachelor" for the first four years of his life, and that the business of killing and skinning these animals,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

though legitimately carried on wholly on land, should be known as a "fishery." But these names when understood have a distinct justification in the peculiarities of the animal, and create no confusion. Moreover, the term "seal" in connection with these animals is itself a misnomer. The original name of "sea-bear," given them by their first discoverer, George Wilhelm Steller (1741), is in every way preferable. The fur seal is not a "seal," nor has it any close affinity with the sub-order of *Pinnipedia*, to which the true or earless seals belong. Beyond the fact that both the fur seal and the hair seal are carnivorous mammals, feeding on fish and adapted for life in the water, the two types have little in common. In structure, appearance, habits, disposition, and method of locomotion, they are entirely distinct; and their evolution as pelagic animals has been along separate lines. The fur seals, with their associates, the walrus and sea-lions, are obviously related to the bears. The hair seals, whatever their origin, must have come along other lines from a different parent stock; and their relation to land *Carnivora* is more remote.

The male fur seal, or "beachmaster," reaches full maturity at the age of seven years. At that time his weight is about four hundred to five hundred pounds; being considerably heavier when first in from the sea in the spring, or after feeding in the fall, than in the intervening period, when he fasts on land and grows gradually lean and weak. The males vary considerably in color, the general shade being black or dark brown, with longer hair or bristles of yellowish white. These are especially long and numerous on the thickened back of the neck; forming the so-called "wig." The wigged males have a rough, coarse coat; and their skins are without market value. The animal makes its home on the rocky shores of the islands in large, closely-massed bands, forming what are called "rookeries." It is extremely gregarious; individuals seldom venturing far from the main body while on land, though wandering about singly in the sea.

The female fur seal is much smaller than the male, and has soft, smooth hair of varying shades of brown, under which is the dense, short, brown fur. The majority of the younger females are silvery white underneath the throat; but some are simply lighter brown. The female bears her first offspring at the age of three years; but her full growth is not attained till two or three years later. The average weight of the grown female is about eighty pounds. The young of the fur seal, called a "pup," is born soon after the arrival of the female. Its weight at birth is about ten pounds.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fur seal is polygamous, each male capable of holding a place on the breeding-grounds having from one to one hundred females in his charge, constituting what is known as a "harem"; the average number being about thirty. But the size of each family is subject to variation; depending not chiefly on the strength of the male, but on the preference of the female for a location, and on the topography of the ground.

The young male is very similar to the female in color and appearance. He is not permitted to enter the rookeries in the breeding-season. The old males are very particular in this regard; and the "bachelors," as they are called, are forced to herd by themselves on what are known as the "hauling-grounds," located near the breeding-grounds, but distinct from them. While the males and females on the islands are more or less definitely fixed to the spot selected by them on the breeding-rookery, it is not so with these young males; and their movements are very irregular. For this reason the hauling-grounds are much more variable than the breeding-grounds; their occupancy changing from day to day. From these hauling-grounds, in the season when their fur is at its best, the bachelors are driven and killed.

Mixed with the bachelors are found the so-called "half-bulls." These animals have the size and appearance of grown males, but lack their strength and courage, and cannot maintain themselves on the rookeries. Later in the season they leave the hauling-grounds and place themselves around, behind, or above the rookeries, or on rocks awash on the sea-front, where for weeks they watch the operations of their seniors. When the older bulls go out to sea to feed in August, these younger ones come down and take their places with every expression of satisfaction.

The Pribilof group, which constitutes the home of the fur seal, consists of volcanic islands composed entirely of lava and cinders. Two only of these islands, St. Paul and St. George, are important. The smaller islands, each of but a few acres in extent, are known as Otter Island and Walrus Island; and in addition there is the little islet of Sivutch Rock. These islands are in Bering Sea, about two hundred miles to the northwest of Unalaska—the principal harbor of the Aleutian chain of islands—and about forty-five miles apart. St. Paul lies to the northwest of St. George, and is the more important island. It is very irregular in form; its greatest length—about thirteen miles—being from northeast to southwest. Its greatest width is about six miles. St. George Island is about ten miles east and west, by five north and south. It is more elevated than St. Paul;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its central peak, Aluckeyak, being nine hundred and thirty feet high. Its shore outline is scarcely broken by bays or indentations; and most of its coast is formed by walls of basaltic rock. Neither island has a harbor of any sort.

The elevated parts of both islands are covered in summer with mosses and grasses, in which, in July, are surprising numbers of showy wild flowers. The islands are almost constantly enveloped in mist and fog throughout June and July; and the sun is seldom seen. Many stormy days occur; but the storms in summer are not violent, although approach to the islands in rough weather is dangerous on account of the dense fogs. In August there are more clear days; and in bright weather the islands are very picturesque. With the fairer weather the occasional storms become more violent; and by the middle of September all vessels which can get away find it well to leave Bering Sea. With the winter come many clear days alternating with days of tempestuous storm. The snow piles high between the hills; and the floe-ice gathers about the islands, filling the bights and inlets until April or May.

Wherever there is a rocky beach of some breadth, or a sloping, rocky hill on the Pribilof Islands, the fur seals have established their rookeries. The best type of a rookery-ground is a moderate slope, covered with coarse rocks and descending to a beach of shingle or rounded bowlders. On these rookeries the gregarious habits of the fur seals cause them to crowd together as closely as may be,—often to their own disadvantage, as on crowded areas many pups are trampled under foot by the fighting males.

The hauling-grounds of the bachelors are usually sandy beaches adjoining the rookeries, or ascending to the heights above them. Here and there are neutral strips in the long rookeries which have been abandoned to the bachelors, and along which they go back and forth to their hauling-grounds or parade-grounds in the rear. On certain rookeries the bachelors attempt to cross the breeding-grounds by runways which are not recognized as neutral by the adult males. Along these strips, which may be said to be not officially recognized as hauling-grounds, there is constant disputation between the beachmasters and the bachelors.

There are at present twelve breeding-rookeries on St. Paul Island and five on St. George. The largest continuous breeding-area is on St. Paul Island. This great breeding-ground contains fully one-fourth of all the seals on the island. From the summit of Hutchinson Hill,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up the seaward slope of which the harems extend, one can get a magnificent view of this rookery. The sight is most impressive; a greater number of fur seals being visible there than from any other point in the world.

The rookeries of St. George Island are five in number. They contain only about one-sixth of the total number of the fur seals on the two islands. Four of these rookeries, East, Little East, North, and Staraya Artil (old camp), extend along the southern face of the island; while the fifth, Zapadni, lies isolated in the southwestern bay.

So far as is known, every individual fur seal visits the islands in the course of the summer. The youngest come latest; and in general all categories remain until driven away by the winter storms in November and December. The adult males arrive as soon as the ice leaves in the spring (in April or early May). They take up their positions on the rookery-grounds and await the arrival of the females, which event is preceded and accompanied by constant fighting among the males. The earliest cows appear the first week in June. Until the pups are born, and for a few days after, the females are held in rigid control by the bulls; after which time they go to sea to feed, returning at intervals to nurse their young. The cows do not come in all at once; the period of their arrival extending from early June until the middle of August.

The height of the season when there is greatest activity in love and war on the rookeries is from the fifth to the twentieth of July. At this time the harems are ruled with absolute sway by the bulls, which are constantly "rounding up" the cows and crowding them close together. But even then many of the adult cows are absent at sea, feeding, and none of the two-year-olds has arrived. These young cows arrive for the most part during the last week in July, and gather around the young bulls outside the rookery proper. The cows are constantly coming and going; and at no time are much more than half of them present on any rookery.

One pup is born each year, and the sexes at birth are equal in number. For a few days after the pups are born the cows show a maternal interest in them. They nurse them frequently and a cow will lift her newly born pup, as a cat would a kitten, out of the way of the bull. While it is still helpless the cow cannot easily be made to desert her young; but when the pup gets old enough to toddle about she pays little attention to it beyond feeding it. She will run away from her pup without scruple, leaving it to its fate. The pups seem to accept the situation, and get off in pods by themselves;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

playing and sleeping together like a lot of little Newfoundland dogs. When the pups are about a month old they begin to play in sheltered pools of water, and gradually learn to swim. When they have fully learned they go boldly out into the sea in all kinds of weather, and spend much of their time in the water.

Any intrusion upon the breeding-grounds, whether by man or by one of their own number, causes great confusion. If the intruder be a luckless bachelor attempting to make a short cut to the sea, he finds himself "collared" by the first bull into whose domain he comes, and thrown out. The master of the next harem seizes him and treats him in like manner. By the time the unfortunate bachelor has run the gauntlet of bulls and been finally thrown over the cliff into the sea, with torn hide and spent breath, he probably resolves to take next time the farthest way around. If the intruder were a man and fell into the clutches of the bulls, doubtless the result would be practically the same. The old bull is quick to detect the approach of man. He will plunge at him, and, for a few yards, will give him a lively chase. But he rarely goes beyond his square rod of territory; and one can depend on his turning to see what his cows are doing. Experience has taught him that if he leaves his harem the cows will desert, or some of them will be stolen, or even his whole claim may be jumped by another bull. After he has once turned about he will not renew the attack, unless he is forced to do so: malice and revenge are unknown to these ferocious creatures.

When the rookery is thrown into confusion in this way the individual bulls succeed in quieting their harems and restoring order in a surprisingly short time. The bull's method is to rush about the cows, rounding them up, snorting, growling, and blowing his musky breath at them. He often seizes an unruly cow by the neck and pins her to the ground; occasionally he will even catch one by the back and toss her over his head back into the harem. These peremptory measures soon restore order. The cows are always more afraid of the bull than of any intruder. They seem to accept the rough treatment as a matter of course, and to admire the bull's masterful way of doing things. Later on in the season, however, when the harem system has relaxed, the cow loses her fear of the bull and becomes more independent. When she wants to go from the harem and the bull interposes, she bites him in the neck; sometimes tearing away the fur with her sharp teeth. The bull takes it patiently enough; and ultimately, when his back is turned or when he is asleep, the cow gets away.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The bachelor seals have a wholesome and well-grounded fear of the bulls, and keep away from them and the rookeries in the breeding-season. This leads, as already stated, to the institution of separate hauling-grounds on which they wander, play, or sleep at will. The sea in front of the rookeries is also a play-place for them. When the old bulls leave the rookeries in August the bachelors scatter themselves over the breeding-grounds with their brothers the half-bulls; the latter endeavoring to round up harems and play the part of the older bulls. The cows pay very little attention to them,—a fact which in no wise diminishes their pride in their new relations. From these older bachelors the harem masters are recruited year by year, and at the beginning of each season a certain number of these young fellows appear on the rookery-grounds to fight for places. Most of them are whipped and thrown out at their first attempts; but gradually they gain the strength and the experience which ultimately enable them to win and maintain harems of their own.

On the islands for the last half-century only the young males have been killed. As these herd by themselves they can be driven up without disturbing the breeding seals, and they can be handled much as a flock of sheep are handled. The regular killing season begins about the first of June and closes about the first of August. After the tenth of August the skins become "stagy" from the change of fur, and are not in prime condition again until after the middle of October.

From the hauling-grounds the bachelors of all ages are driven up in bands to the killing-grounds, located at convenient distances from the rookeries, and near ponds of fresh water in which the seals can be cooled off after their exertions. To prevent, as far as possible, overheating, the drives are made at night, usually beginning at two A.M. As the severity of the drives has been the subject of considerable discussion, and as many impossible results have been attributed to them, the following detailed account of a drive on St. Paul Island, witnessed by the writers, may be of interest:

"We left the village at two o'clock in the morning to make the drive of seals from Reef and Gorbatch rookeries. It was then light enough to make our way without difficulty. After a few minutes we reached Zolotoi sands, a beach about one-fourth of a mile from the village, at the angle of which the bachelors from Gorbatch rookery haul out to reach the rocky slope above. The drivers ran in quickly between the seals and the water and soon had the animals rounded up in a large pod. From a similar hauling-ground on the shore, just across the neck of the peninsula, another pod was in like manner rounded up. The two pods combined were left in charge of three men to be driven across the sands to the village killing-ground a few hundred yards beyond.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We then proceeded to the extreme point of Reef peninsula. The hauling-ground of Reef rookery lies in the rear of the breeding-ground and has four well-marked runways connecting it with the sea, on which no harems are located. A line of idle bulls keeps clear a considerable space between the hauling-ground and the harems. From the head of the various runways and in the intervening space pods of sleeping bachelors were rounded up; the Aleuts passing between the idle bulls and the bachelors and turning the latter up the bank to the flat parade-ground back of the hauling-ground. Here the pods were all united in one large group; and the drive started on its way at half past three o'clock.

After passing over a short space of ground, scattered at wide intervals with irregular bowlders and having a gentle downward slope, the drive came to the level plain of the parade-ground. Here the herd, which numbered about 1,500 bachelors, was separated into two parts, for greater ease and safety in driving. While one pod was allowed to rest, the other was driven slowly forward in the direction of the village. Three men were now assigned to each pod, and the rest of the drivers allowed to return to the village to make ready for the killing.

Over the green turf of the parade-ground the drive moved quietly and without difficulty. The drivers took their positions, one on each flank to repress any lateral movements; and a third brought up the rear. There was no noise or confusion. In general the seals were allowed to take their own time and to go at their own pace. Those in advance acted as leaders and the rest of the herd followed naturally after them. At the beginning the seals showed some reluctance in leaving their hauling-grounds, and made ineffectual attempts to break away. But after the drive got under way they moved forward as a matter of course. When the leaders showed any inclination to turn aside, the man on the flank simply stood up and raised a hand, which was sufficient to turn them back into the course. For the most part the man kept out of the sight of the seals.

There was a tendency on the part of the younger seals to go faster than the older ones, of which a number were included. By a gradual shifting process the old fellows fell to the rear; and on several occasions pods of from a dozen to twenty were cut off and allowed to return to the sea.

All the seals, and especially the larger ones, showed signs of fatigue. They became hot and excited; and a cloud of steam having a strong musky smell arose constantly from the moving animals. When the herd stopped, individual seals would often sprawl out on the ground, raising their hind flippers and waving them fan-like; evidently in an effort to cool off. After resting a moment the seals were ready to move on again refreshed. Continuous exertion is evidently hard on them; but they quickly recover from exhaustion. As soon as the flock comes to rest for a few moments' breathing, they begin to bite one another and push each other about in an unconcerned fashion until they are reminded by the movements of their companions that they too must keep moving. When the herd has been brought to rest for a few minutes, to start it again the rear man has only to clap his hands or rattle his stick on a rock.

A short distance brought us to the end of the grassy plain and into an area of ground filled with embedded bowlders. These were for the most part flat and worn smooth. It looked like hard ground for the seals; but they really seemed to get over it better than the flat ground, on which there was constant crowding, while the rocks kept the seals apart.

After passing over a slight ridge where the passage-way became narrowed by projecting cliffs and where there was a good deal of crowding and scrambling,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the drive left the bowlder-strewn path and passed into a valley overgrown with tall rye-grass and lying between sand-dunes also grass-grown. The seals seemed to be refreshed by the moisture of the grass, which was wet with dew and rain.

This grassy plain led into the top of the bowlder-set slope above Zolotoi sands, from which the earlier seals were driven. Down this slope the herd moved without difficulty and came into the level sand-flat. Here the first really hard work of the drive began. The seals seemed to find their greatest difficulty in walking on the yielding sand. Their flippers take hold of the rocks like rubber, but slip back on the sand. They stepped on each other's flippers, became much excited, and seemed generally worried.

But in a few minutes the sands were passed and the herd emerged into the grass-grown killing-ground. As soon as they came to a standstill all seemed at once to forget their troubles. They began biting, snarling, and blowing at one another as though nothing had happened. They were turned into the little lake beside the killing-ground to cool off, and were then herded up on the bank to rest before their turn came to be killed.

It was five minutes after five when the first herd reached the killing-ground. The second arrived three-quarters of an hour later, having taken more time on the way."

This drive is the hardest one made on the Pribilof Islands. It is, however, less than a mile in length, and has no hills. One or two other drives are longer; but the ground covered is grass-grown and easier for the seals to get over.

After the seals have cooled off and rested the killing is begun. The larger droves are separated into small pods of twenty to thirty, which in succession are driven up within reach of men armed with stout clubs. These "cull" out the killable seals by striking them on the head, allowing those not suitable for killing to escape and go back to the sea. The blow of the club renders the animal unconscious. It is then bled by sticking to the heart with a knife, and is immediately afterward skinned. Only three-year-olds and very small four-year-olds or large two-year-olds are taken. No females are ever killed on the Islands. The methods of killing and skinning seals are the results of many years of experience, and though simple, are effective and well adapted to the animals with which they deal. Occasionally accidents occur. On warm mornings a seal may be overcome by heat on the drive, or it may be smothered by the crowding of a pod, or clubbed by mistake; but deaths from such causes are rare, not over a dozen having been known to occur during the past season out of a total of 30,000 seals killed, besides many driven up but rejected on the killing-ground.

There is no evidence that the race of fur seals as a whole has been in any way affected by the arbitrary selection of males for killing, or by the methods of handling them. Only strong, vigorous males can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maintain themselves on the rookeries in any case, and those allowed to live to replenish the stock are not more nor less vigorous than the others would have been. A strong selective influence is exercised by the migrations in the sea. No decrepit individuals have been known to come back in the spring. The rough sea of the North tells no tales; and we know very little of the severity of the sorting process which every year sends back to the Islands only those fit to survive. From the ruthless natural destruction of all seals, in which the geographical instinct or the instincts of feeding and reproduction are defective, results the extreme perfection of those few instincts which the animal possesses. The life-processes of the fur seal are as perfect as clockwork; but its grade of intelligence is low. Its range of choice in action is very slight. It is a wonderful automaton; and the stress of its migrations will always keep it so. A fur seal will do to perfection what its ancestors have had to do; but if it is forced to do anything else it becomes dazed and stupid.

Owing to the polygamous habit of the fur seal, a limited number of males suffices for the needs of the herd. The land killing of males, therefore, is not only possible without injury, but becomes a positive necessity to the growth of the herd. For the 143,071 females in the Islands during the past season there were 8,005 adult males, and 2,996 of these were superfluous, as they could not get possession of cows until the height of the season was past. They spent their time in fighting among themselves or attacking the more successful bulls. The evil effects of an overstock of males have never hitherto been fully understood or estimated. The chief natural cause of death on the rookeries among females and young pups is found in the wrangling of the bulls and the struggles of the reserve of idle bulls to steal cows from the harems. In 1896, 11,045 pups were thus trampled to death on the Pribilof Islands; and about 130 cows were killed by the rough seizure of the bulls in their struggle for possession. As the fur seal herd has year by year grown less crowded, this mortality has probably never reached so low a percentage before. In the original or wild state of the herd, when the number of adult bulls was nearly equal to that of the cows, this destruction must have been enormous, perhaps approaching 200,000 each year. It was undoubtedly the chief check to the indefinite increase of the herd, the death of these thousands being adequate to compensate for the natural increase.

During the breeding-season the adult males do not eat or drink or leave their places on the rookeries. During the killing-season the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stomachs of the bachelors are found to be empty. It has been supposed on this account that they fasted or ate very little during the summer. This is not necessarily the case; for examination of the stomachs of a number of cows on land also disclosed no food. The fur seals simply do not come on land until the food in their stomachs is digested. A mass of seals is to be seen throughout the entire season sleeping or swimming about in an aimless fashion before the rookeries and hauling-grounds; and from this fringe of idle seals off shore—never directly from the sea—the landing cows and bachelors are seen to come. These are seals that have arrived before their food was fully digested.

The seals feed at great and various distances from the Islands. They are found from June to November between 165° and 175°, west longitude, in a broad tract stretching northwesterly from the vicinity of Unimak Pass to latitude 61°, which is their great feeding-ground.

The food of the fur seal consists mainly of surface-swimming fishes and of squid. As to the species of fish, the animal has probably little choice. It does not dive deeply; and its food naturally comprises the shallow-water or surface fishes on its feeding-grounds. In Bering Sea, in August and September, a still undescribed species of deep water smelt is by far the most important fish. Next to this comes the Alaskan pollock. Salmon are eaten when found, and occasionally species of smaller fishes. No cod has yet been found in the stomach of a seal.

The size of the Pribilof Islands herd, according to the traditions of the Aleuts, reached its lowest possible point some fifty or more years ago at the time of the great ice-jam, in which many thousand seals, males and females, were drowned while attempting to climb the inaccessible bergs and floes. Of the condition of the herd in Russian times we have no very clear record, but when it passed into American control in 1868 it was in good condition and rapidly increasing. Until 1872, and perhaps a few years after, the herd continued to increase. During the ten years following it doubtless remained practically in a state of equilibrium under the various checks acting upon it, of which the trampling of pups was the chief. This loss can be checked in future, or almost entirely prevented, by covering the level and open parts of the rookeries with large rocks, under which the pups can hide, and which check the movement of the bulls. The "death-traps" on Zapadni have been already thus treated. In 1883 the herd began to decline—slowly at first, then more rapidly.

In the days of its maximum prosperity—1872 to 1882—there were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doubtless about 2,500,000 seals of all classes on the Islands. To-day there are about 450,000 seals of all classes, the herd having declined to about one-fifth its greatest size. The sole cause of this decline is pelagic sealing,—the killing of fur seals in the open sea with fire-arms or with the spear and club. After feeding, the seals lie and sleep on the surface of the water while digesting their food. Taking advantage of this habit, the hunter steals up in his boat, and shoots or spears the sleeping animal.

Other things being equal, the maintenance or increase of a herd of animals depends upon the birth-rate; that is, on the number of breeding females. On shore the life of the female fur seal is sacred: she is like a domestic animal of high value. Even in those days when there ran "no law of God or man to the north of fifty-three" severe penalties were visited on men taken in the act of killing female fur seals on St. George Island. It was well known that if there were to be seals in the future the lives of the females must be preserved. On the seas, however, the female is treated as a wild beast, to be killed on sight. The sealers cannot distinguish the sex of the animal in the water, and so kill every one they can get. Pelagic sealing is, therefore, indiscriminate killing, or killing without reference to sex, age, or condition.

On the Pribilof Islands the number of female fur seals, exclusive of the young of the year, is about double the number of males. The smaller number of the males is due to land killing, the quota of skins taken by the lessees of the Islands being made up wholly of young males. On the feeding-grounds the same disproportion of the sexes holds true, heightened by the fact that the cow must feed regularly and constantly because of the necessity for nursing her offspring. It follows, therefore, that the greater part of the animals taken at sea are females; and the records of pelagic sealing bear this out, showing that upwards of 75 per cent of the catch are cows.

Each adult female fur seal found on the feeding-grounds in Bering Sea has a pup on the Island dependent upon her for nourishment. It has been clearly demonstrated the past summer that the pup fur seal does not feed on other food than its mother's milk while it remains on the islands. It necessarily follows that whenever the mother seal dies or is killed before weaning, the pup, however large or vigorous, must starve to death. In 1896, 16,019 pups dead from starvation were found on St. Paul and St. George. These deaths resulted from the killing of the mothers at sea. And not only does the death of the mother involve the death of her nursing offspring, but, since the cows are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never permitted by the bulls to leave the harems in the short interval between the birth of the pup and re-impregnation it also involves the death of the unborn pup. The death of a nursing female fur seal, therefore, involves the loss of three lives, and is wasteful and ruinous in the extreme. Since pelagic sealing began, upward of 400,000 adult female fur seals have been killed at sea, 300,000 pups have been starved to death on land, and 400,000 unborn pups destroyed.

The pelagic sealing fleet attacks the herd in January off San Francisco, where its return migration begins. It follows the animals northward along the coast of British Columbia and Alaska to the passes of the Aleutian Islands. The females are then heavy with young. Being more sluggish in their movements and sleeping more soundly than the males, they form here also the greater majority of the seals taken. In May, June, and July, pelagic sealing is forbidden off the American shores, and the predatory fleet crosses to Japan and attacks the herd of the Commander Islands. With the first of August the fleet returns from Japan, enters Bering Sea, and continues its work until driven out in September by the winter storms.

The returns from the American schooners engaged in pelagic sealing for the past season show the percentage of females in the Northwest or coast-wise catch to have been 92, in the Bering Sea catch, 72.

To understand the relation of pelagic sealing to the decline of the herd, we have only to consider the history of the decline in the light of the history of the catch. During the greater part of the period of maximum prosperity of the herd (1872–1882), pelagic sealing was carried on off the Northwest coast chiefly by Indians in open canoes, the annual catch averaging about 5,000,—a scarcely appreciable drain on the herd. In 1878 this catch increased to 8,000; in 1881 to 10,000; the following year to 15,000; and in 1883 to 16,000. Under this increased catch the equilibrium was broken and the decline began. With this year the pelagic sealers entered Bering Sea. In 1885 the Northwest catch numbered 21,000, and the following year the Bering Sea catch amounted to 14,000. Up to 1887 the loss had been so gradual as to excite but little notice. In that year it manifested itself in a difficulty in getting the quota. Since that time, with an interruption of two years (1892–3), during the *modus vivendi*, pelagic sealing has rapidly increased and the herd has correspondingly declined.

Since the establishment of the closed season for Bering Sea in May, June, and July, the sealers have crossed over and spent these months preying on the herds of the Commander and Robben Islands off the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coast of Japan, returning to enter Bering Sea in August. Pelagic sealing began in 1891 on the Asiatic side but it was then already a full-grown industry; and the result has been that these Asiatic herds have suffered even more heavily than the Pribilof herd in a much shorter time. The Commander Islands herd—at its best but half the size of the Pribilof herd—is now barely one-third the latter.

The conditions of the fur seal question are very simple. A race of animals having their breeding-home on certain islands in Bering Sea, and going out from these islands long distances for food, are attacked on their feeding-grounds and indiscriminately killed; the females being the chief sufferers, and their dependent as well as unborn offspring dying with them. Driven by the stress of climate to migrate to the south in winter, these animals are again attacked on their return in the spring, and again indiscriminately slaughtered.

No one considering these facts, none of which is now open to dispute, can fail to see that this indiscriminate killing—in other words, pelagic sealing—is an adequate cause for the decline of the fur seal herd. There being no other cause discernible, it must be accepted as the sole cause. It is equally plain that if the fur seals are to be preserved and protected the one and only way is through the absolute prohibition of pelagic sealing. There is no way to distinguish and exempt the females in the water; therefore no form of regulated sealing will answer. No regulation giving a closed season to Bering Sea but allowing an open season off the Northwest coast will answer. For it makes no difference to the herd whether the cow is killed with her unborn pup within her, or whether she is killed after its birth and the pup left to starve to death.

Land killing, properly managed, does not affect the herd except in a beneficial way. The natural mortality due to overcrowding can be greatly lessened by the still closer killing of the males, and can be practically removed by proper care of the breeding-grounds. With proper protection to the females, the herd may be restored to its greatest prosperity: it may even be largely increased. But there is no hope for the herd unless and until such protection is accorded.

The regulations "for the protection and preservation" of the fur seal adopted by the Paris Tribunal have failed of their object. All familiar with the facts knew that they must fail. But the mistake is not fatal, and the rectification is not difficult. The ultimate end in view in any future negotiation must be an international arrangement whereby all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

skins of female fur seals shall be seized and destroyed by the customs authorities of civilized nations, whether taken on land or sea, from the Pribilof herd, the Asiatic herds, or in the lawless raiding of the Antarctic rookeries. In the destruction of the fur seal rookeries of the Antarctic, as well as those of the Kuril Islands and Bering Sea, "American enterprise" has taken a leading part. It would be well for us to lead the way in stopping pelagic sealing by restraining our own citizens, without waiting for the action of other nations. We can ask for protection with better grace when we have accorded unasked protection to others. The moral strength of the American contention has been lost through the fact that we have shamelessly allowed American vessels to prey on our own herd and that of friendly Russia. To-day off San Francisco our vessels are destroying female fur seals worth to us under protection $40 each for breeding purposes, in order to get their skins, which are worth in the London market about $9 each.

The monstrous proposition to destroy the fur seal herd because it has been injured by pelagic sealing ought not to be considered for a moment. It would be a confession of impotence unworthy of a great and civilized nation. If a mere "bluff," the proposition is ineffective: if taken seriously, it is abominable. Its results would be to transfer to ourselves any odium which has deservedly fallen upon those who would recklessly destroy a most useful and interesting race of animals.

Nor are we driven to this extremity. If we fail to secure a remedy through mutual agreement with Great Britain we can ourselves destroy pelagic sealing by branding the females and herding the males during August. Experiments carried on by us show that the female pups can be branded so as to destroy the value of the skin, without injury to the animal. This is a safe and effective method, and should be tried if it should be impossible to secure fair play. But now that the conditions are clearly understood, there is no good reason why the matter cannot be honorably and amicably adjusted, to the satisfaction of all the nations concerned. The McKinley Administration has few duties more important than to bring about this adjustment.

DAVID STARR JORDAN,
Chief of the Bering Sea Commission for 1896.

GEORGE ARCHIBALD CLARK,
Secretary to the Commission.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARBITRATION THE ONLY SOLUTION OF THE FINANCIAL PROBLEM.

THE Presidential campaign of 1896 did not result in the decisive settlement—so essential to an era of substantial prosperity—of the question, *What shall be the coinage, currency, and banking system of the United States?* Twenty years of political agitation of this problem have failed to bring its solution. All that has been gained is time in which to consider and bring the question to a direct issue before the people, during which time existing conditions should stand unchanged. Is it therefore necessary that the welfare of the people should suffer from a confidence-destroying agitation of the currency question for two or four years more? I answer—No. In the light of experience it is just and right for the people to demand that the disputants shall now submit their cause to some tribunal competent to decide it in the interests of the general welfare.

The Greenback-Silver coinage and currency demands originated in the Greenback agitation of 1874–6, which resulted in the prohibition of any further cancellation of United States treasury notes. Agitation was resumed in 1878 by the Greenback-Silver demand for a larger use of silver; their opponents contending simply for the maintenance of existing conditions. This agitation resulted in the enactment of the Bland Law, under authority of which 378,166,793 silver dollars were coined.

The coinage and currency question again became acute in 1890. Greenback-Silver advocates demanded the free coinage of silver. Their opponents contested that demand, and finally agreed, as a compromise, to the purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver per month and a monthly issue of treasury notes to the amount of the silver purchase. Under authority of the Silver Purchase Act of 1890, $155,931,002 in greenbacks (treasury notes) were issued.

The legislation of 1874–6, 1878, and 1890 terminated in the monetary panic of 1893, at which time a general demand was made for the repeal of the mandatory purchase of silver contained in the act of 1890. The repeal measure became a law November 1, 1893, since which time no coinage or currency legislation has been enacted.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1896, the agitation for currency reform again became acute. Greenback-Silver advocates demanded the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. Their opponents, although conscious that some measure of currency reform was a vital necessity, formulated no proposal looking to that end; again contenting themselves with contending for the maintenance of existing conditions. The 7,100,000 voters who supported the successful ticket were in agreement in desiring the maintenance of the existing gold standard. For this cause alone persons differing widely on questions of tariff or currency reform voted the same ticket. A clear-cut, well-defined scheme of currency reform was not before them. The 6,500,000 voters who supported the unsuccessful ticket, which demanded the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, and the prohibition of all banks of issue under State or national charters, included those who believed in the policy advocated, and those who believed in party regularity regardless of the principles affirmed in the national platform. It cannot be said that a ruling majority was in agreement regarding a single measure requiring legislative action necessary to establish such conditions.

In October, 1893, I read a paper before the American Bankers' Association, under the title of "A Plea for a Sound Currency and Banking System,"* for the purpose of creating which I urged the appointment of a non-political national commission. This demand was immediately repeated by influential newspapers, boards of trade, and chambers of commerce throughout the country, and was recommended by the Comptroller of the Currency in his Annual Report for 1894.

In his remarks addressed to the Association, immediately following the reading of my paper, Mr. George S. Coe said:—

> "Is there not in the natural exchanges of property passing through the hands of producers and consumers the real and fundamental currency most required for all sound banking?
>
> Aside from the great subject of coined money, which will doubtless be deemed of prime importance, the question of currency, by which the exchanges of the whole community are chiefly made, must demand the most serious consideration. . . . The attempt must now be most diligently made to create a system that will take the place of all others, and, if possible, one that will eminently deserve the national preference."

In a paper read before the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, December, 1893,* I said:—

* Published in full in "A Sound Currency and Banking System; How it may be Secured." G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The mistakes of 1874–6, 1878, 1890 must not be repeated. Those who favor sound money are fully as responsible for these mistakes as are those charged with advocating monetary fallacies. When the demand first came from the South and West for still further issues of United States legal-tender notes, and, this failing, for the suspension of the redemption and cancellation of such notes, it should have been treated as a signal of distress. Sound-money advocates from every section of the country should have met this call by examining promptly the needs of the sections from which it emanated, and, after sufficient investigation, they should have proposed sound-money measures which would have brought the desired relief. Had this been done then, the monetary fallacies from which we are now (1893) suffering would be powerless for evil."

These appeals were not heeded. After the struggle to secure the repeal of the silver-purchase measure in 1893 the ruling majority of the people made no effort to follow up that result with a determined movement to secure an intelligent and comprehensive revision of coinage, currency, and banking laws, and thus to remove all cause of want of confidence in, or dissatisfaction with, our monetary system. As a result, the prosperity they fondly expected to see follow the repeal of the silver-purchase measure never came.

The compromises of 1874–6, 1878, 1890, resulted, as all settlements based on unsound economic principles must result, in retaining or injecting poison into our monetary system. So long as this poison remains, it will render a condition of perfect health impossible.

Having cast their votes in accordance with their judgment as to the best policy for the promotion of prosperity, the people now earnestly desire a cessation of confidence-destroying currency agitation, in order that they may again devote themselves with energy to money-making vocations, to produce the prosperity they had eagerly hoped to see follow the close of the Presidential campaign. It will be a sad day for the people of this country if they repeat in 1897 the mistakes of 1874–6, 1878, 1890, and 1893, cherish the delusive idea that prosperity will follow the results of this election, and fail at once to set themselves earnestly to provide for a complete revision of coinage, currency, and banking laws, with the view of permanently settling the question. If this is not done, and our monetary system is not brought into accord with the requirements of correct economic principles, the evils resulting from the errors of the past will be perpetuated. Twenty years' experience should be sufficient to teach the people that this conclusion is true. Every intelligent observer who has closely studied the course of events since 1873 is now ready to admit that, if a season of satisfying prosperity is not realized before the Congressional cam-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paign of 1898 and the Presidential campaign of 1900, the Greenback-Silver advocates may be victorious at the first, and will surely be successful at the later, election.

One evil resulting from the political agitation of the past lies in the fact that much has been taught to the uninformed that is not true, and much that is true has been rejected by the people because it was urged upon their attention by professional political orators and in the publications of campaign committees. The lesson that should have been taught to those who cried out for "more money," in the years from 1873 to 1897, must now be taught to the people of all sections of the country. It is this: An intelligent use of the resources possessed by any community will supply all the currency that can be required to promptly effect the legitimate exchanges of its industry and commerce. Prosperity is dependent upon an intelligent use of resources and opportunities, regulated by correct laws, and should not be the victim of changeable State or Congressional legislation. Assisted by a correct coinage, currency, and banking system, the people of every section can so use their own resources as to secure all the monetary relief for which they have ever asked. They will then realize the truth, that self-help is the countersign of economic freedom. Then prosperity will come.

It may be well at this point to examine briefly some fundamental economic conditions.

Natural economic laws are true standards. By complying with their requirements man may govern natural forces; but he cannot by his edicts suspend their action. They are unaffected by his ignorance, unchanged by his importunity, uninfluenced by his necessities. If, by understanding and conforming to the requirements of natural laws, man cannot satisfy all the needs of his being, some of his needs must remain unsatisfied. There is no source of supply except the resources of nature, prepared and distributed by human industry for the use of man. If legislation which controls production and distribution is not properly aligned in every detail with correct economic principles, it cannot operate with equal justice for all men: it will make the labor of production unnecessarily burdensome for some; and it will create a deficiency in some places, a surplus in others.

Applying these observations to the subject under consideration, as an answer to those who demand "more money," the following, from a recently published book,[1] is pertinent:—

[1] "The Natural Law of Money," by WILLIAM BROUGH. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Money is a product of man's labor—a commodity. It is not any one specific thing, but may be almost anything, and is money only by reason of its fitness, at the time, for the service to be performed. In any given community there is a limit to the number of articles produced, and, in earlier times, this limit was very much narrower than now; but, however limited the number of commodities may be, there are always one or two that supply the money-want more efficiently than others. Now, as almost any commodity may be used as money, such a thing as a lack of it is not possible so long as man continues to be a producer of commodities; although he may, by false legislation, corrupt his money or throw restrictions around it, and thus lessen its efficiency. All over the world there have been examples of such false legislation wherever governments conceived it to be their function to regulate the value of money."

Coined money is a natural development from a primitive system of effecting exchanges by barter. It is itself a commodity, the product of man's labor, and is a refinement in the processes and instruments of distribution. As a means for effecting exchanges its services are of high value, but not of the highest.

With a growth of the knowledge of the science and art of commerce there came not only a knowledge of the utility of coined money, but also a knowledge of money arithmetic, which developed a new form of money known as "the money of account." Its service is to cause all commodities to lose their identity as commodities and to become factors of *value*. In making a bill of merchandise each commodity is listed by name: its quality, quantity, and value are given. Value is expressed in terms of the money of account. By this process all commodities are reduced to a common denominator, and are thereafter treated as items of value expressed as dollars. Being dollars, they can be dealt with by the rules of arithmetic, added, subtracted, multiplied, divided, or broken into fractions, as the case may require.

A bill of merchandise must represent commodities delivered at an agreed price, before it can become a legal claim. It is therefore a medium of exchange, as it is a means by which the ownership of commodities is shown to have passed from seller to buyer. Whoever sells a commodity, whether it be his labor or the product of his labor, by that act creates dollars. There must always be as many dollars in the money of account as are required to represent the full value of all exchanges of labor, or the products of labor. A lack of dollars cannot exist unless there is a lack of commodities, or where no buyer can be found who will purchase the commodities offered for sale. The dollar of the money of account is not created by the fiat of law, of the seller, or of the buyer alone. The seller expresses his idea of value in *price asked*. The buyer expresses his idea of value in *price offered*. When

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an agreement is effected, *value is determined by the agreed price.* At its value so determined, the commodity is represented as dollars in the money of account.

Following the development of the money of account, by means of which all commodities are transformed into dollars, the next and highest refinement in the monetary processes and instruments of exchange was made by devising written or printed instruments to represent the latent value and ownership of commodities. A promise to pay, expressed in dollars, is an order given by the maker upon himself for the delivery of commodities on demand, or at maturity if it has a time limit, to the value expressed in the order. The credit involved in such an order may be based on any exchangeable commodity. It may be predicated on but one commodity, as is the case with gold or silver certificates, or it may practically include the value of all commodities "passing through the hands of producers and consumers," as is the case with clearing-house certificates or bank-note currency secured by "quick assets."

An important and far-reaching step in facilitating exchanges was taken when bank-note currency was devised, by means of which any and every commodity, at its value in the money of account, can be made current in the channels of commerce. The cause of suffering experienced from lack of currency with which promptly to effect all desired exchanges of commodities at an *agreed price-value*, originates in legislation which deprives the people of the right to use the current value of their commodities as a basis for the currency they require. Instead of issuing currency on the broad foundation of the values of *all* commodities, the basis has been narrowed by false legislation to but two commodities—gold and silver—which are produced by a few people. In this way the people have been deprived of the facilities and benefits derivable from the free use of the most effective form of monetary instruments of exchange,—bank-note currency based on "quick assets."

When this evil has been remedied, and not until then, will sound currency conditions be created that will induce prosperity to the full extent to which it can be induced by a comprehensive and correct revision of coinage, currency, and banking laws. There will then be established a sound "American financial policy for the American people."

The first effort in every controversy should be to find all points of agreement and use them as a common basis upon which to construct

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the final and complete agreement sought. If this be not the object of a controversy, it is objectless, and should not be permitted to engage the thought and time of earnest men.

All advocates of currency reform, regardless of their party affiliations, claim that they desire "honest money," "sound currency," the faithful discharge of all public and private obligations in strict accord with the requirements of national and personal honor and integrity, and that the policy they advocate receives their endorsement solely because they believe it to be best for the welfare of the people and of the nation. No party has a monopoly of wisdom, practical common sense, or personal honor. Each can concede to opponents all they claim in these respects, and use this as a common basis of agreement. The present is an opportune time to call a halt on partisan discussion, and to raise the issue of currency reform to the higher level of patriotic emulation, where party advantage and party regularity will give way to a united endeavor to promote the general welfare.

All parties declare their earnest wish to see the people of the United States in the full enjoyment of a continuous era of satisfying prosperity. Every truly loyal citizen will be glad to see prosperity come, even though its coming is induced by a policy or methods differing, no matter how radically, from those he has advocated.

Mr. Cleveland in his Annual Message to Congress, December 7, 1896, said:—

> "Our business interests and all good citizens long for rest from feverish agitation, and the inauguration by the Government of a reformed financial policy which shall encourage enterprise and make certain the rewards of industry."

Senator Teller, speaking in the United States Senate, December 16, 1896, remarked:—

> "I want prosperity in the United States. I believe it can be brought to the people by a decent financial system. I do not believe it can be brought in any other way. I am not so wedded to the silver question, however, as not to welcome prosperity from any source that it may come."

Twenty years of partisan discussion and strife is sufficient. All honest-minded, patriotic men can now afford to submit to arbitration for final settlement their differences of opinion on monetary questions.

Tariff- and currency-reform issues are issues wholly unrelated, and should be separated for consideration and action. Partisans favoring certain measures pertaining to one issue should be prevented from demanding concessions for their proposals as the price of their support of measures pertaining to the other issue. The vital importance of these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

issues is acknowledged by the prominence given them in the discussions and creeds of all political parties; but there is a wide difference in opinion as to which of the two is paramount. Upon this point opinions may be condensed into three groups:

1. That prosperity can be most effectually secured by a thorough revision of tariff laws to give adequate protection to all American interests, and to increase the revenues; existing currency conditions remaining substantially unchanged, and the agitation for currency reform to cease.

2. That tariff revision to give adequate protection to American interests and to increase the revenues is necessary; that such measures are not of themselves sufficient to induce an era of substantial prosperity; but a comprehensive reform of our monetary system must be effected and the agitation for changes in our currency system by this means be stopped.

3. Agitation for currency reform must result in a comprehensive revision of all coinage, currency, and banking laws; and, until this result is gained, efforts for its accomplishment must continue without abatement. Tariff reform cannot of itself improve conditions or stop currency agitation.

From this grouping the deduction may be made that the objective point of all parties is prosperity, and that a settled condition of the tariff, whether for protection or revenue only, and of the currency, whether under existing conditions or those proposed by the advocates of Greenback-Silver measures, or such other basis as may be agreed upon, is a fundamental prerequisite to prosperity. In this deduction one fact is prominent: For both the tariff and the currency systems stability of conditions must be established, so that those engaged in industrial and commercial vocations may be relieved from the uncertainty, the strain, and the disasters resulting from every Congressional or Presidential election.

By making the tariff the special issue for consideration by the Fifty-fifth Congress, and the currency the special issue for consideration by the Fifty-sixth Congress, the tariff and currency issues may be isolated for consideration and action. To facilitate the work for currency reform, without continuing the confidence-destroying effects of a feverish public agitation, and without permitting it to be interposed as an element of obstruction or compromise in the settlement of the tariff issue, a scientific, practical, non-partisan currency commission, to report in March, 1898, should at once be authorized and provided for.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The consideration of currency-reform measures having been provided for by the creation of a special commission for that purpose, and all proposals pertaining to that subject being referred to the commission, the Fifty-fifth Congress and the Administration will have a clear field for a comprehensive discussion and revision of tariff legislation, the improvement of the revenues, and for all other subjects pertaining to the domestic and foreign policies of the nation. If, by these efforts, prosperity for the whole people is induced, who will be so unjust, so unpatriotic, as to wish to overturn that result? On the other hand, if those who oppose such an adjustment of the tariff as may be made by the advocates of legislative protection for American industries are right, the failure of the effort so to induce prosperity will be a source of never-failing strength to them when the issue of currency reform is before the people for final settlement. By this arrangement the advocates of both issues will have an opportunity to assume the responsibility of their convictions and to formulate proposals for carrying them into effect, each without hindrance from the other in securing consideration or action; for both will obtain consideration simultaneously, the one before Congress, the other before the commission; and each will be brought to final action in a separate Congress,—the advocates of currency reform having the advantage of bringing their proposals for final action before a Congress elected with special reference to that issue.

Another reason for constituting a currency commission, as proposed, is found in the fact that the advocates of the gold standard, of bimetallism, and of Greenback-Silver measures have become so intensely earnest in their convictions that they can see nothing but dire calamity in store for the people, if their peculiar views are not expressed in practical legislation.

William J. Bryan, in his lecture at Atlanta, Georgia, December 23, 1896, said:—

> "If I should tell you what system will establish that [least changeable unit] you might believe me wrong. If you told me what system you thought would give me the best dollar, the dollar most nearly honest, I might not agree with you. But when I tell you that the aim of both of us should be to come to the nearest approach to absolute stability and absolute justice between man and man, you must agree with me in the purpose, however you differ from me in the means of arriving at it."

This statement shows clearly that the period for general discussion should be closed, that the time for arbitration has come. When unyielding disputants holding opposing views of methods are in agreement as to their objective point,—and every intelligent, honest-minded per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

son in this country can unreservedly agree with Mr. Bryan in his final proposal,—the only rational course the contestants can pursue is to submit their opposing views to the arbitration of a jury of their peers for adjustment, and agree to abide by the decision rendered.

It is assumed that the personnel of the commission will command the confidence and respect of the people; that it will be composed of men whose intelligence, honor, sagacity, ability, and judicial fairness, considered individually or collectively, will be questioned by no intelligent, honest-minded person. The people can accept the judgment of such a commission as being the opinion of capable men who have deliberately listened to all arguments, examined all evidence, considered the condition and requirements of every section and vocation, and made its recommendations solely for the highest good of the nation. Recommendations so made, and acted upon after having been submitted to the people for approval, will eliminate from future discussions all such base insinuations and derogatory charges as those which followed the revision of coinage laws in 1873, and the subsequent demands for the free coinage of silver. In devising an "American financial policy for the American people" it is not only necessary that the policy shall be right in itself: it is of equal importance that it is believed to be right by the ruling majority of the people.

The recommendations and report of the commission, if made during the month of March, 1898, would be before the people in sufficient time to become the paramount issue in the Congressional campaign of that year. This would bring the proposals of the majority and the minority to a direct issue before the people on their respective merits. The Congress then elected would have no doubt as to what course it should pursue in enacting measures for currency reform, and would not be retarded in its action by other issues of overshadowing importance. Every man who places national welfare and the prosperity of the whole people above party advantage will approve this course. Any man can afford to be proved wrong, if thereby prosperity comes.

An American financial policy formulated by a commission approved by a popular vote of the people, and then enacted into law by their representatives, can be made the soundest, most stable, and most helpful system ever devised for the welfare of any nation or people. It will be as unchanging a cause of prosperity, as beneficent and far-reaching in its power for good, as the Declaration of American Independence and the Constitution of the Republic.

ALLEN RIPLEY FOOTE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THOREAU AND EMERSON.

EVERY year testifies more and more to the increasing fame of Henry Thoreau,—careless of popularity as he was, and much looked down upon by many of the critics who noticed him when he began to publish his original writings. The recent essays on him by various writers are quite unlike in tone much that passed for criticism thirty years ago,—notably the ill-disguised pique and prejudice of Lowell.

There is now a call for the completion of his diaries of the seasons —which still lack four months of filling out the round year—in the manner of editing chosen by his editor. After that has been done, still much of the journals will remain unprinted; something also of other manuscripts, and a few letters that have escaped the collectors.

One almost fancies Miss Amelia Watson's pretty colored sketches to illustrate Thoreau's "Cape Cod" are too dainty and bright for the sober hues of that cape, and the cool atmosphere of Thoreau's prose; but the varied mysteries and glittering beauties of that region are in this mode of illustration well brought out. The next book to be illustrated should be "Walden," and the lovely tameness of Concord scenery might be reproduced by engravings as it has never yet been. An English edition of poems selected from the "Dial" of 1840–44, containing some of Thoreau's verses, is announced by W. R. Nicoll, with short biographical sketches of the writers. Thoreau hardly needs a biographer; already six books of biography, besides a dozen sketches, have appeared since his death in 1862. The most original of these is Ellery Channing's; the most recent, the shorter "Life" by Henry Salt, Thoreau's English disciple.

Maria Mitchell, visiting Dr. Whewell at Cambridge, England, in 1857, reports him as complaining that Emerson wrote bad English, and imitated Carlyle,—a remark that showed how little the omniscient Master of Trinity knew about the style of either. Lowell could see the contrast between the dialect of these two friends, and pointed it out in a memorable passage in his "Fable for Critics"; but Lowell made the kindred mistake of thinking that Thoreau imitated Emerson. He said much the same about Ellery Channing, between whom and Emer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

son, in style, there was hardly a shade of resemblance. This passage is worth citing, with the blanks filled up:—

"There comes Channing, for instance; to see him 's rare sport,
Tread in Emerson's tracks with legs painfully short;
How he jumps, how he strains, and gets red in the face,
To keep step with the mystagogue's natural pace!
He follows as close as a stick to a rocket,
His fingers exploring the prophet's each pocket.
Fie, for shame, brother bard! with good fruit of your own,
Can't you let Neighbor Emerson's orchards alone?
Besides, 't is no use,—you 'll not find e'en a core,—
Thoreau has picked up all the windfalls before.
They might strip every tree, and E. never would catch 'em;
His Hesperides have no rude dragon to watch 'em:
When they send him a dishful, and ask him to try 'em,
He never suspects how the sly rogues came by 'em;
He wonders how 't is there are none such *his* trees on,
And thinks 'em the best he has tasted this season."

This is good drollery, and illustrates well enough the generosity of Emerson; but it is ludicrously untrue. Channing the poet, and Thoreau the poet-naturalist, being some fifteen years younger than Emerson, naturally came under his influence; both were too original to borrow.

There were traits of manner and of speech in which Thoreau, like so many of his younger friends, unconsciously imitated Emerson; and this made so much impression on the superficial observer—on myself, for instance, when I first came into daily relations with the two men—that all sorts of remarks were in vogue about it. "Look at Thoreau," said a Boston wit, in 1849, glancing at the Concord recluse, across the street, "he is getting up a nose like Emerson's." In truth, he could as easily have altered the aquiline form of his nose, as have changed in any essential respect his sturdily original character.

With Channing this was still more true; and I doubt if anyone who really knew him ever charged that he imitated Emerson in nose, manner, or anything else. I once fancied the form of Channing's verse had been influenced by Emerson's frequent use of the octosyllable, as in "Woodnotes," or "The Humble-Bee," and my choice example of this influence was a poem of Channing's to "The Spider," commencing,

"Habitant of castle gray,
Creeping thing in sober way,
Visible sage mechanician,
Skilfullest arithmetician,
Aged animal at birth,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wanting joy and idle mirth;
Clothed in famous tunic old,
Vestments black, of many a fold,
Spotted mightily with gold."

Now would you not call that an imitation of Emerson?—especially if indoctrinated with Lowell's scoffing critique. But,—as I found out many years after reading it,—"The Spider" was first published in 1835, before Emerson had published any verse.

Nobody ever charged, I think, that Thoreau's verse was modelled on that of Emerson: it had a quality of its own so peculiar that no such imitation was supposable. In the substance of what they wrote, whether verse or prose, there was a certain resemblance, due to the fact that they were born in the same atmosphere of New England's thought and morals; looked upon the same phenomena of nature and man; read the same books, to a great extent; and associated much with each other. We have often laughed at the story of Thoreau's mother, proud of her son's genius, and accounting for this similarity of thought between him and Emerson by saying,—"O yes! Mr. Emerson has been a good deal with David Henry"; but, in fact, it will be found that the direct influence of the younger friend on the thought of the elder was quite as great as the reverse. And this because, with all his originality, Emerson was more sensitive than Thoreau to literary influence.

It is not easy to trace the parentage of Emerson's thoughts; but it is very easy, oftentimes, to see whence came their rhetorical expression in that particular form which he chose to give them. In Thoreau's case, as in Channing's, the form is quite as original as the sentiment or thought. Thoreau said of Channing, "He is naturally whimsical, as a cow is brindled"; and never was a remark more true of both the sayer and its object.

But beneath this whimsicality (much less marked in Emerson's case, though he glorified Whim, as we know) there burned a steady, pure flame of poetic thought and moral purpose. This was a trait of all the Concord authors, not excepting Hawthorne, whose mode of expression was so much his own. In what, then, does the difference between Emerson and Thoreau consist? And is it fundamental, like their resemblance on intellectual and moral grounds, or only casual, from slight dissimilarity in temperament and training? Closely connected with this question is that other one, which some of the younger readers of Thoreau are raising,—whether the fame of Emerson in liter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ature and philosophy will be so permanent as that of his younger and more scientific contemporary; whether, indeed, the style of Thoreau is not better suited to literary immortality than that of Emerson.

I take it that the striking characteristic of both these men was their wisdom,—their distinct superiority to most contemporaries in those things for which men ought to care, and which they ought to know. They were both philosophers, in the ancient sense; that is, men who followed truth wherever it led them, and who valued intellectual and spiritual truth more than the transient rewards of human labor, or the shining premiums of mental distinction. Both were, obviously, persons of unusual endowment, who, had they so chosen, might have won many prizes in the contest for honor and wealth, which so engages the effort of most men. Instead of this struggle, they declined the competition, and, in comparative seclusion, devoted themselves to the observation of nature, the pursuit of wisdom, and the instruction of their fellow-men in the nobler ways of human occupation. Both were of a poetic turn of mind, incapable of looking at life in the literal, prosaic way habitual to most of us; both were of a hardy moral constitution, so that self-denial and retirement were not difficult for them. They were even inclined to be stoical, and perhaps undervalued the prizes of life. But with all this, they were full of sentiment, quick to love that which appeals to the affections, and with all the aspirations and generosities which a movement for the uplifting of the social condition of mankind requires. They were reformers, rather than conservatives; yet with a great infusion of that which constitutes true conservatism, —a devotion to the primary objects of human existence. To preserve any given institution did not seem to them so important as to hold sacred that out of which all worthy institutions have grown,—the fundamental principles of moral and political action. In all this, Emerson and Thoreau were alike; but they differed widely in the inherited traits which distinguish one soul from another, and which seem to acquire greater force the longer our race continues.

Heredity has had at different times a very different consideration among men; but we must regard it as always a potent influence on individual character. If arts and gifts and tendencies are inherited (as we know they are), so are faults and contradictions and maladies, whether mental or physical. Education may correct these tendencies, or increase them; restrain these faults or inflame them; cure these maladies or induce them; but in our cup of life there lies, after all, a strong sediment of hereditary influence, more and more perceptible as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the draught grows shallower and the bottom is almost in sight. As an old Englishman observed, in another connection,

> "Clouds of affection from our younger eyes
> Conceal that emptiness which age descries."

Now the inheritance of Emerson was from a long line of clerical and gentlemanly ancestors, to whom the conventionalities of life had a value which they never could have acquired among the trading, seafaring, joking, and nonchalant forebears of Henry Thoreau. To this inheritance Emerson owed that matchless propriety and decorum which was as manifest in him as in George Washington,—a sense of what was fitting on all the occasions of life, and a consideration for the tastes and feelings of others, which makes him almost unique among reformers. There was also in him that inborn leadership which gives its charm to ancient aristocracies, no less than to new potencies like those of Napoleon and Cromwell: the princely quality was most evident in his nature, and finds expression in his pages more than in those of any other modern author. With Thoreau, these traits were replaced by a sturdy and trenchant individualism, somewhat scanty of respect for what is merely conventional, especially if a little outgrown; and he was little disposed to make those concessions in minor matters which the daily intercourse of life requires for its smooth movement. He was at heart profoundly unselfish and courteous; but on the surface rather brusque and pugnacious; and, at times, with all his distinction, a little plebeian in his bearing. Such qualities provoked opposition, and did not pass unnoticed even by Emerson.

As time slipped by with these chosen friends, and the young enthusiast of 1837 became the settled and audacious questioner of 1857, the unavoidable collision of such opposite traits took place. We find in the published journals of Thoreau—and doubtless should find in the unpublished diaries of Emerson—evidences of this collision, some of which may be quoted.

It was in the diaries of Thoreau, as we know, that those lofty utterances on Friendship, which appeared in his "Week," were first entered; and, after 1849, he had the habit of continuing that topic from year to year, in his Journal, in which the "Week" was published. Thus, in December, 1851, he says:—

> "Last night I treated my dearest friend ill. Though I could find some excuse for myself, it is not such excuse as under the circumstances could be pleaded in so many words. Instantly I blamed myself, and sought an opportunity to make atonement; but the friend avoided me, and, with kinder feelings than be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fore, even, I was obliged to depart. And now, this morning I feel that it is too late to speak of the trifle; and besides, I doubt now, in the cool morning, if I have a right to suppose such intimate and serious relations as afford a basis for the apology I had conceived; for even magnanimity must ask this poor earth for a field. The virtues even wait for invitation. Yet I am resolved to know that one centrally, through thick and thin; and though we should be cold to one another,—though we should never speak to one another,—I well know that inward and essential love may exist under a superficial coldness, and that the laws of attraction speak louder than words. Methinks our estrangement is only like the divergence of the branches which unite in the stem."

Only two persons could have answered in 1851 to this description of "my dearest friend,"—Emerson and Ellery Channing; and I suppose the first-named to have been the one meant.

But five years later a more serious estrangement occurred; after the return of Emerson from a lecturing tour in the West, begun in December, 1856. What was its occasion, there is nothing in print to show; but that Thoreau believed it (incorrectly) to be final, is evident from the sad tone he adopts, in contrast to that just cited:—

(February 8, 1857.) "And now another friendship is ended. I do not know what has made my friend doubt me; but I know that in love there is no mistake, and that any estrangement is well founded. But my destiny is not narrowed,—rather, if possible, the broader for it. The heavens withdraw and arch themselves higher. I am sensible not only of a moral, but even of a grand physical pain, such as gods may feel, about my head and breast,—a certain ache and fulness. This rending of a tie, it is not my work, nor thine. It is no accident that we may avoid: it is only the award of fate that is affecting us. I know of no æons or periods, no life and death, but these meetings and separations. My life is like a stream that is suddenly dammed, and has no outlet. But it rises higher up the hills that shut it in, and will become a deep and silent lake.

Certainly there is no event comparable for grandeur with the eternal separation, if we may conceive it so, from a being that we have known. I become in a degree sensible of the meaning of 'finite,' and 'infinite.' What a grand significance the word 'never' acquires! With one with whom we have walked on high ground, we cannot deal on any lower ground ever after. We have tried so many years to put each other to this immortal use,—and have failed. Undoubtedly our good genii have found (mutually) the material unsuitable. We have hitherto paid each other the highest possible compliment; we have recognized each other constantly as divine; have afforded each other that opportunity to live that no other wealth or kindness can afford. And now, for some reason inappreciable by us, it has become necessary for us to withhold this mutual aid. Perchance there is none beside who knows us for a god, and none whom we know for such. Each man and woman is a veritable god or goddess, but to the mass of their fellows disguised. There is only one in each case who sees through the disguise. That one who does not stand so near to any man as to see the divinity in him is truly alone.

I am perfectly sad at parting from you. I could better have the earth taken from under my feet than the thought of you from my mind. One while I think

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that some great wrong has been done, with which you are implicated; again, that you are no party to it. I fear that there may be incessant tragedies; that one may treat his fellow as a god, but receive somewhat less regard from him. I now, almost for the first time, fear this. Yet I believe that in the long run there is no such inequality."

A few days later, Thoreau returns to this painful theme, and almost implies one of the reasons for the estrangement:—

(February 16, 1857.) "I perceive that some persons are enveloped and confined by a certain crust of manners, which, though it may sometimes be a fair and transparent enamel, yet only repels and saddens the beholder; since by its rigidity it seems to repress all further expansion. They are viewed at a distance, like an insect under a tumbler. They have, as it were, prematurely hardened both seed and shell, and this has severely taxed, if not put a period to, the life of the plant. This is to stand upon your dignity. Manners get to be human parchment, in which sensible books are often bound, and honorable titles engrossed,—though they may be very stiff and dry."

(February 19.) "A man cannot be said to succeed in this life who does not satisfy one friend." (February 23.) "I say in my thought to my neighbor who was once my friend, 'It is no use to speak the truth to you. You will not hear it. What then shall I say to you? You cheat me, you keep me at a distance with your manners. I know of no other dishonesty, no other devil. Why this doubleness, these compliments? They are the worst of lies: a lie is not worse between traders than a compliment between friends. Lying, on lower levels, is but a trivial offence compared with civility and compliment on the level of Friendship.'".

These sayings identify Emerson as the friend whose manners keep others at a distance,—since Thoreau had no other intimate of whom this could be said; while it was true of Emerson, as Alcott and others have left on record. What the primary occasion of the estrangement was, we cannot know: that it was exaggerated by Thoreau in these passages is quite evident, since a part of his rhetoric consisted in exaggeration. But it was a real and profound grief to him, as the following entries in his Journal show:—

(February 23, 1857.) "At the instant that I seem to be saying farewell forever to one who has been my friend, I find myself unexpectedly near to him; and it is our very nearness and dearness to each other that gives depth and significance to that 'forever.' Thus I am a helpless prisoner,—and these chains I have no skill to break. While I think I have broken one link, I have been forging another.

I have not yet known a friendship to cease, I think. I fear I have experienced its decaying. Morning, noon, and night I suffer a physical pain, an aching of the breast which unfits me for my tasks. It is perhaps most intense at evening. With respect to Friendship I feel like a wreck that is driving before the gale, with a crew suffering from hunger and thirst, not knowing what shore they may reach,—so long have I breasted the conflicting waves of this sentiment,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

my seams open and my timbers laid bare. I float on Friendship's sea, simply because my specific gravity is less than its,—but no longer that stanch and graceful vessel that careered so buoyantly over it. My planks and timbers are scattered; at most I hope to make a sort of raft of Friendship, on which, with a few of our treasures we may float to some land. . . That aching of the breast,—the grandest pain that man endures,—which no other can assuage!

If the teeth ache, they can be pulled. If the heart aches, what then? Shall we pluck it out? Must friends then expect the fate of those Oriental twins,—that one shall at last bear about the corpse of the other by that same ligature which bound him to a living companion?"

This is immensely sad; but it seems to have been a passing cloud over one of the longest and fairest friendships. In an earlier diary we find this quatrain addressed to the sun coming out in the afternoon:—

"Methinks all things have travelled since you shined,—
But only Time and clouds, Time's team, have moved;
Again, foul weather shall not change my mind,
But in the shade I will believe what in the sun I loved."

Thoreau was wise enough to allow for both sun and shade; or if a parting with friends must come, he could address them in a more cheerful strain, as in the Journal for March 28, 1856:—

"Farewell, my friends! My path inclines to this side the mountains,—yours to that. For a long time you have appeared farther and farther off to me. I see that you will at length disappear altogether. For a season my path seems lonely without you. The meadows are like barren ground. The memory of me is steadily passing away from you. My path grows narrower and steeper, and the night is approaching. Yet I have faith that in the infinite future new suns will rise and new plains expand before me; and I trust I shall therein encounter pilgrims who bear the same virtue that I recognized in you,—who will be that very virtue that was you. I accept that everlasting and salutary law, which was promulgated as much that spring when I first knew you, as this, when I seem to leave you."

I have compared these passages, as they stand in the printed pages which Mr. Blake has edited, with the original Journals in his possession,—and he seems to have given all that is essential in the manuscript. No name appears, to identify the person mentioned; but there can be no doubt who he was. The final passage reminds me, in its imagery, of a mystical poem of Thoreau's which remained in Emerson's possession long after its author's death, and came to me from Emerson, inscribed in his handwriting, "H. D. Thoreau, June, 1843." It was probably intended for the "Dial," but withheld, and is now printed for the first time, so far as I know. Thoreau entitled it, "The Just Made Perfect":—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" A stately music rises on my ear,
Borne by the breeze from some adjacent vale;
A host of knights, my own true ancestors,
March to the lofty strains and pass away.

In long procession, to this music's sound,
The Just move onward in deep serried ranks,
With looks serene of hope, and gleaming brows,
As if they were the temples of the day,
Gilt by some unseen sun's resplendent beam.
They firmly move, sure as the lapse of Time,
Departed worth, leaving these trivial fields
Where no aim worthy sedate valor finds,
And still the noblest cause of all is Fame.

Forward they press and with exalted eye,
As if their road, which seems a level plain,
Did yet ascend, and were again subdued
'Neath their proud feet. Forward they move, and leave
The sun and moon and stars alone behind:
And now by the still fainter strains I know
They surely pass; and soon their quivering harp
And faintly-clashing cymbal will have ceased
To feed my ear.

It is the steadiest motion eye hath seen;
A Godlike progress,—e'en the hills and rocks
Do forward come, as to congratulate
Their feet; the rivers eddy backward, and
The waves recurl to accompany their march.
Onward they move, like to the life of man,
Which cannot rest, but goes without delay
Right to the gates of Death,—not losing time
In its majestic tread to Eternity.

As if Man's blood, a river, flowed right on
Far as the eye could reach, to the heart of hearts,
Nor eddied round about these complex limbs,
'T is the slow march of life,—I feel the feet
Of tiny drops go pattering through *my* veins.
Their arteries flow with an Assyrian pace,
And empires rise and fall beneath their stride;
Still as they move flees the horizon wall,
The low-roofed sky o'erarching their true path;
For they have caught at last the pace of Heaven,
Their great commander's true and timely tread.

Lo! now the sky before them is cast up
Into an arched road, like the gallery
Of the small mouse that bores the meadow-turf:
Chapels of ease swift open o'er their road,
And domes continuous span the lengthening way."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is there not something Dantesque in this interchange of lofty and humble imagery? The thought is a familiar one with Thoreau and Emerson,—the moving of life to music. Thoreau's "Rumors from an Æolian Harp" has the same image, which we meet elsewhere in both writers. Their souls were attuned to each other,—as Persius said of himself and the Stoic Cornutus, "Nescio quod certe est quod te mihi temperat astrum."

Still there were wide differences; and this temporary separation may serve to point out another distinction between them. With all his seclusion and stoicism, Thoreau was less impersonal than Emerson: nay, his very retirement and his paucity of friends made him cling the more firmly to the few he had. Emerson's range was wider; his horizon was more ample; but he did not attach himself so closely to those things and thoughts in which he took an interest. Hence we find more form in the thought of Emerson, more color in that of Thoreau; and, so far as literary style is concerned, the page of Thoreau often excels that of Emerson. Both are epigrammatic; but the epigrams of Thoreau are the more keen and searching, if not so elegant. Emerson dealt more with principles, Thoreau with facts. He had the homely wisdom of Socrates, while Emerson rejoiced in the lofty sweep of Plato. In their learning, which was great,—as Americans reckon the scope of learning,—Thoreau was the more exact, Emerson the more comprehensive and suggestive. Both were masters of English; but in Emerson was more mannerism, in Thoreau more rhetorical art in his best pages, more simplicity in his ordinary writing. Both will endure as authors; and will continue to attract and to instruct, by their deep, cheerful wisdom, and their high moral purpose.

A few years after the date of the sorro vful diaries cited, Thoreau fell ill and was cared for in many ways by Emerson, as by his other friends; but they had come together long before that, in their mutual regard for John Brown, the Kansas hero, whom Emerson first met, in 1857, at Thoreau's house. At Brown's funeral service in Concord, December 2, 1859, they joined in praising his valor; and at Thoreau's own funeral, less than three years later, Emerson closed his eulogium of his friend by saying: "His soul was made for the noblest society; he had in a short life exhausted the capabilities of this world; wherever there is knowledge, wherever there is virtue, wherever there is beauty, he will find a home."

F. B. Sanborn.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SHALL NEVADA BE DEPRIVED OF STATEHOOD?

In the course of a spirited editorial article entitled, "How to Deal with Nevada," the Chicago "Tribune" remarked:—

> "Congress is perfectly able to deal with the unprecedented condition of affairs which exists in Nevada. The silver-mines which made her all she was have been exhausted. She has no other mineral wealth. She has no agricultural resources. She has nothing to attract people; and, as a consequence, she is flickering out."

The "Tribune" urges that the thing to do is to deprive Nevada of her statehood, or at least to exclude her Senators from Congress, as was done with the seceding Southern States during the war and reconstruction periods. The same newspaper serves timely notice upon Wyoming that, failing to show a satisfactory growth in population when the census of 1900 shall be returned, that State also may be invited to march out of the Union with her unfortunate neighbor. These suggestions have been quoted with approval by many newspapers; and the feasibility of merging Nevada into the more populous State of Utah has also been widely discussed during the past few years.

To degrade loyal States by depriving them of important attributes of their sovereignty would be radical, if not revolutionary. If it were suspected that the real motive for their unprecedented humiliation was the fact that they disagreed politically with a view strenuously held by about 52 per cent of the voters in the nation, and persistently acted with the minority of 48 per cent, it is possible that the proposed proceeding would be worse than radical,—perilous indeed, and fraught with new evils more dangerous than those which it is sought to remove. But happily the time has not come when it is necessary to appeal to the deeper and graver arguments which might be urged against the dissolution of the Union on the instalment plan.

There are four simple and lucid reasons why the Chicago newspaper's prescription, "How to Deal with Nevada," should not be thoughtlessly taken. The first is that it is not true that "the silver-mines which made her all she was have been exhausted." The second is that it is not true that "she has no other mineral wealth." The third is that it is not true that "she has no agricultural resources." And the fourth

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is that it is not true that "she is flickering out," in consequence of the fact that "she has nothing to attract people." If I may be permitted the pleasure of introducing the State of Nevada to the American people, through these pages, I think it may be proved that the eminent Chicago physician entirely misunderstood the symptoms of the disease, utterly failed in his diagnosis, and, as a matter of course, erred in his suggestion of remedies. As the so-called "sage-brush States" (sage-brush is unerring evidence of kindly soil and abundant sunshine) have been the objects of ardent abuse, which serves no other purpose than to feed the hateful passion of sectional distrust, such an introduction seems well worth while.

Nevada, then, is potentially one of the great States of the Union. Her natural resources are more varied, more valuable, and more extensive than those pertaining to most of the States east of the Mississippi, and even some of the States west of the river. The statement that her silver-mines are "exhausted" is a palpable absurdity. The humor of it is so broad that all readers of gold-standard newspapers should instantly appreciate it, since they have repeatedly been told that Nevada asks for free coinage in the purely selfish hope that that policy would re-open her silver-mines and thereby restore her former extraordinary prosperity. If the mines were really "exhausted," an unlimited demand for silver at $1.29 an ounce would benefit Nevada no more than Vermont. Nevadans believe, of course, that the entire public would be benefited by the higher prices and enlarged circulation which they confidently expect would follow free coinage; but they make no pretence of denying their further expectation that their own State would receive a peculiar benefit in consequence of the revival of her leading local industry. The hand that would rob Nevada of her reputation as a silver-producer should at least make haste to restore her reputation for disinterested patriotism. She cannot logically be deprived of both at the same time.

The silver-mines which made the State "all she was" were principally those of the famous Comstock lode, which produced more than $500,000,000 in precious metals; of Eureka, $125,000,000; of Austin, $36,000,000; of Lincoln County, $30,000,000; of Esmeralda County, $20,000,000; of Elko County, $10,000,000. There were many other camps of lesser moment. Now, it is perfectly true that the extraction of such vast amounts wrought material changes in the character of some of these mines,—notably the Comstock. It by no means follows, however, that the deposits of ore have been "ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hausted." The richer ores were utilized at a time when silver commanded a high price, and when economy in milling was not important. But it may be asserted upon the best authority that even the mines of the Comstock, some of which have been worked to a depth of 3,000 feet, possess well-nigh unlimited quantities of ore running from $6 to $15 per ton, and that under more favorable conditions for silver-mining the famous lode would perhaps duplicate its peerless record of the past. It is not likely that fabulous profits will ever again be realized. It is certainly not to be desired that the old romance of life in Virginia City, with its hot fever of speculation, its glittering successes, and its tragic disappointments, should be reënacted. But, though bonanza days are of the past, better days of sober industrial development are in the future.

This statement applies yet more forcibly to other old camps. With few exceptions, deep mining has not been pursued. Only the richer ores near the surface have been utilized, and these by expensive processes and at high cost of transportation. Eureka, Austin, and Tuscarora, and the districts in Lincoln and Esmeralda Counties—all great producers in the past—are yet rich in silver ore averaging $8 to $20 per ton. Not only are the old camps far from "exhausted," but the undeveloped resources in this direction are far from explored. It is not denied by anyone that admittedly great silver camps in Utah, in Colorado, in Idaho, and in Montana have been compelled to cease operations, partially or completely, as a result of the depression of prices. The same is true of Nevada; but she also labors under peculiar disadvantages in the lack of transportation facilities. In the extreme southern counties mines have to ship ore to the reduction works at Salt Lake City at a cost of $15 per ton. There are other localities where the transportation charge ranges from $20 to $100 per ton, and where great ore-bodies, carrying $30 to $60 per ton in precious metals, lie unworked in consequence. The prostration of the silver industry in Nevada is due to a number of causes; but the fact that the "silver-mines which made her all she was have been exhausted" is not one of them.

The statement that Nevada "has no other mineral wealth" is equally wide of the truth. The actual extent and value of such resources in any country cannot be known in advance of thorough development; but the amazing variety of Nevada's natural endowments is a fact which no well-informed person ventures to dispute. Calling the roll of the fourteen counties, nearly all answer to the truth of this claim.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Elko, in the extreme northeastern corner of the State, yielded placer gold to the earliest prospectors of the Great Basin, and has gold-ledges of promising extent and value which are now being carefully explored. Humboldt, central on the northern boundary, presents as great a variety of resources as any district in the United States. Besides silver, it possesses gold, copper, lead, tin, iron, antimony, nickel, cobalt, bismuth, nitre, sulphur, gypsum, borax, soda, and salt. Coarse gold, to the value of several millions, has been taken from its placer and gravel mines. Gypsum is shipped to San Francisco for fertilizer. Near Lovelock, in this county, are great hills of fine bessemer-iron ore, yielding 86 per cent of iron and 12 per cent of aluminum, with no trace of impurities. Eureka County, in the central part of the State, has many mines in which gold predominates, besides large deposits of magnetic-iron ore, of lead, of granite and other building stones. Lander, adjoining Eureka on the west, has valuable undeveloped gold deposits, and the richest mines of antimony in the world. Of the western counties, Washoe reports recent discoveries of gold, copper, and iron; Douglas, quartz and placer gold; Lyon, mines which run high in gold, with but little silver; Churchill, gold, copper, and other minerals; while Storey contains the Comstock. Esmeralda, bordering California on the extreme southwest, is very rich in gold-bearing quartz, and is being actively developed. Lincoln and Nye, the two great counties of the south, have gold, copper, lead, antimony, zinc, quicksilver, fire-clay, chalk, soapstone, borax, and alum. In Lincoln there is a deposit of zinc, estimated to be worth several millions, which cannot be worked for lack of transportation facilities. There are hills of salt the product of which commands locally but $1 per ton, owing to its inaccessibility, though other localities in the State pay $20 to $40 per ton for a similar product. White Pine County, along the eastern boundary, has extensive gold-placers. Finally there is a large deposit in Elko County of something which is said never to have been discovered elsewhere; viz., mineral soap, superior in cleansing virtues to any of the manufactured varieties known to the students of modern advertising. As the country was principally occupied by Piute Indians the deposit remained undisturbed for nameless centuries; but it was exhibited at the World's Fair where, it is feared, it added nothing to Nevada's fame. The thing was so palpably and unmistakably the perfection of toilet articles that it overtaxed Eastern credulity, and was quietly set down as a larger piece of mendacity than of soap.

It is further charged that Nevada "has no agricultural resources."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Of all arraignments, this is the most mistaken and unjust; yet it is the one which will find readiest credence by those who know the State only through the experience of a restless day's travel by railroad across its waste of sage-brush, of sunshine, and of dust. The more need, then, for its emphatic refutation; for there are millions of Nevada acres which might answer the cry of thousands of homeless men.

The territorial grandeur of the Battle-born commonwealth is not a matter of dispute. In the East it would fill a space from central Pennsylvania to Georgia, and from Delaware Bay to Ohio. But as Nevada is very arid, having but ten inches of rainfall and but little of that in the growing season, the measure of its capacity to support population is the extent of the water-supply. Upon the all-important subject of the water-supply of an arid and half-explored country authorities seldom agree. They cannot do so in advance of thorough scientific investigation; especially where the dependence is largely upon flood-waters, springs, and artesian wells. But the most painstaking and systematic inquiry ever made into this branch of Nevada's resources resulted in the conclusion that at least 6,000,000 acres of rich soil could be irrigated. Such was the report of the State Commission, appointed under the auspices of the Irrigation Congress in 1893, of which the late Governor John E. Jones was chairman. The material for the report was gathered with the assistance of sub-committees in every county; and the conclusions undoubtedly represent the best judgment of practical men intimately acquainted with the subject in its local details. The Commission reported twenty lakes and sixteen rivers of importance. Of the utility of the latter, it said that the Carson, Walker, and Truckee, flowing eastward from the Sierras, would irrigate in Nevada 1,000,000 acres; the Humboldt, another 1,000,000; the Salmon, Bruneau, and Owyhee, in the extreme northeast, 400,000; the Quinn, which descends from its Oregon sources into Nevada, 175,000; the Virgin, on the extreme southeast, 100,000. Minor rivers and a multitude of springs were counted available for the reclamation of 2,400,000 acres; while the artesian supplies would bring the total for the State to at least 6,000,000 acres.

The authors of these conclusions—among the most responsible men in the State—declare them to be well within the bounds of conservatism. For the present purpose, however, the figures may be reduced two-thirds, and still leave an ample foundation for population in Nevada. Two States which no one dreams of expelling from the Union are Colorado and Utah. The splendid agricultural prosperity of those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arid commonwealths is based on a cultivated area of only about 2,000,000 acres. There is no excuse for assuming that with a reasonable development of her resources, mineral and manufacturing as well as agricultural, Nevada could not sustain at least as many people as do Utah and Colorado in their present condition of partial development. Neither of those States has begun to approach the full realization of her possibilities, though even now they maintain a combined population of about three-quarters of a million. This figure is a low estimate of Nevada's capacity in that direction.

The products of the irrigated lands of Nevada are the fruits, vegetables, cereals, and grasses of the temperate zone, and, in the extreme southern portions, the more delicate fruits of the semi-tropics. Average crops are thirty-five bushels of wheat per acre, sixty bushels of barley, seventy-five bushels of oats, three hundred bushels of potatoes, and four to eight tons of alfalfa, which is the leading forage grass. In the extreme southern counties, where the altitude is but 400 feet above sea-level, and where the warm breath of the Gulf of California is received through the cañons of the Colorado River, figs, olives, pomegranates, almonds, English walnuts, and, in sheltered places, even oranges, may be produced. The climate of Nevada, as these products indicate, covers a wide range. Like all parts of the arid region, it is distinguished by pure, dry air, an extraordinary amount of sunshine, and, consequently, a very high degree of healthfulness. It is a climate fit to breed a robust and vigorous race.

These are not the popular impressions of Nevada; but the traveller who has left his hot and dusty car to breathe the cool fragrance of the little oasis at Humboldt, to walk for a few moments within the shade of its trees, and to hear the music of its waters, should not hesitate to accept them as true. The little patch of green which a hillside spring has spoken into being here is a sample of what millions of desert acres will become. Farther on, the traveller catches a twilight glimpse of the thriving farms of Lovelock, or of the green Truckee meadows. But the larger examples of irrigation lie off the beaten path. Such an instance is the Carson Valley, hidden between the sheltering shoulders of the Sierras. To appreciate the possibilities of this derided State, the critic should visit that valley in the perfect Nevada springtime, and look upon its farms, homes, and villages. There he would behold a memorable picture of thrift, of beauty, and of peace,—from the white blossoms in the dooryards to the white summits of the mountains. And there he might read the true prophecy of Nevada's future.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If, then, this State is "flickering out," it is emphatically not due to the fact that "she has nothing to attract people." Resembling Utah and, less closely, Colorado in climate and resources, there are reasons which account for her poverty of population and backwardness of development. It is perhaps worth while briefly to review them.

The men made rich by the mines of Colorado had the gratitude and patriotism to spend their money where they made it. Tabor gave Denver her first important impulse by erecting splendid buildings as monuments to his faith in the city's future. Hagerman planted the Midland Railway on the continental divide, and invested millions in reclaiming arid lands tributary to Colorado commerce. General Palmer, the railroad pioneer, founded Colorado Springs, encouraged improvements in every direction, and built his home in the State which had rewarded his daring enterprise. Such was the spirit of most of the successful Coloradans toward the country which gave them their opportunities. The wealth taken from the mines and railroads of Nevada, on the other hand, contributed nothing to the embellishment of her cities or the conquest of her waste places. It went to build palaces in San Francisco, New York, and London, and to increase the social gayety of Newport and Paris. It would not be just to infer that the difference in the attitude of the two sets of millionaires was wholly due to their individual characteristics. Circumstances had much to do with it,—notably the fact that in Nevada the mining industry was mostly concentrated in a single great camp, which enhanced its speculative character, and the other fact that the superlative attractions of California lay within a few hours' ride of Virginia City. But the difference, nevertheless, wrought momentous results in the fortunes of the States.

The railroad situation is another important factor in the backwardness of Nevada. Whenever a single railroad controls the inlet and outlet of a State, the industrial and commercial destinies of that State are, to a large extent, committed to the keeping of that railroad. These facts are further emphasized when it happens that the railroad runs through agricultural territory and possesses a land grant covering every other section for a distance of twenty miles on both sides of the track. Development necessarily hinges on the policy of the railroad, both as to rates and as to the encouragement of enterprise. The only alternative is to build a competing line; and this is extremely difficult if the construction of the first has not resulted in the development of the country and in the growth of its population. Nevada in a flourishing condition would invite competition not merely for her own business,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but also for the rich spoil of California's traffic. Nevada as a stretch of hopeless desert, on the other hand, constitutes a perfect insurance against competition for the larger prize on the farther side of the Sierras. It has not been the policy of the Central Pacific to make this "risk" extra-hazardous, or to increase its cost, by developing the territory between Utah and California. It is sometimes charged that the Central Pacific is distinctly hostile to Nevada. The probable truth is that, having the interest of their whole great system to consider, the managers arrange their policies according to the dictates of shrewd business sense, and that Nevada has merely the ill-fortune to be pinched in the process. If it would have paid the Central Pacific better to develop the State than to let it remain a wilderness, it would have been developed. Just criticism should be directed to the system which permits the private ownership of public highways and not against individuals; since human nature is everywhere much alike.

Utah was developed without the aid of railroads or millionaires; but Utah has always had a colonization policy. If Brigham Young had not recalled his colonists from the valleys of the Carson, the Walker, and the Truckee during the 'fifties no one would now complain of a decreasing population,—a sin never charged against the Mormons. The difference between the sister States of the Great Basin is not an affair of raw materials. It is the difference between the results of speculative mining, on one hand, and of the patient development of agricultural resources by methods of sober industry on the other.

Nevada is the victim of circumstances. Rich in the potentialities of material greatness, and therefore strong in the capacity to support a social structure, she presents the baffling paradox of a declining population in a Western State. If she were located in South Africa, the nations of Europe would plot and struggle for possession of her minerals, lands, and waters; if in New South Wales, the colonial government would employ the public capital to reclaim her deserts, and to enable the surplus population of Adelaide to make homes upon her soil; if in Germany, the Imperial government would charter "rent banks" to operate under a commission in preparing the land for settlement and building humble houses, to be purchased by home-seekers on generous terms; if in Holland, the servants of the little Queen would extend the admirable colonies which have flourished for seventy-five years, graduating thousands of needy men from beggary to tenantry, from tenantry to proprietorship. But Nevada is in the United States; and the remedy for her misfortune is—to deprive her of her Senators!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If anything is to be done for Nevada, the impulse must come from without. Ninety-five per cent of her great area is public land and the property of the nation. The present land laws were made in ignorance of the conditions imposed by aridity, and are practically unsuited for any honest and intelligent purpose of home-making. The citizenship of the State is composed of miners, who care nothing for agricultural expansion; of farmers, who are not anxious to foster competition; of stockmen, who want undisturbed possession of water-privileges for their herds; and of merchants and professional men who are helpless to turn the wheel of progress. Congressman Newlands made an elaborate effort to awaken interest in irrigation development a few years ago, offering to back it with his large means; but it came to nothing because of public indifference and subtle opposition. The same conditions prevented the strong effort of the late Governor Jones—a man who had the progress of his State deeply at heart—from reforming the water-laws and providing an irrigation administrative system. It would not be difficult to suggest palliative methods which would help to turn the tide in the right direction. For instance, certain favored districts might be withdrawn from settlement under present laws, and granted, with special inducements, to organizations like the Salvation Army, or Commander Booth's Volunteers, who might reclaim and colonize them in coöperation with philanthropic persons. But the truth is that Nevada's decadence is due to economic evils common to the arid region,—to evils which call for deeper and broader measures than can be applied to any single locality.

If the proposition to alter the political status of Nevada shall become a live issue, it must result in a full discussion of the anomalous and harmful conditions which exist throughout the West. In that case the public conscience will be aroused, and new ideals of national greatness will take possession of the popular imagination. Such a process will lead inevitably to a better understanding between the sections. It will inaugurate a new era of settlement and development; binding together the Far East and the Far West with new ties of blood and new commercial interests. In that case the decline of Nevada will have served a noble end.

WILLIAM E. SMYTHE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DRAMATIC CRITIC: HIS WORK AND ITS INFLUENCE.

ABOUT thirty newspapers, daily and weekly, printed in New York city, employ dramatic critics to express their opinions of the artistic value of plays and acting, and, incidentally, to utter prophecies as to the fate, commercially speaking, of new theatrical productions. Primarily the object of such newspaper criticism must be to inform the public about the plays and the actors, and to advise people who have money to spend for theatrical diversion where best to invest it. Judged from that point of view, no individual expression of opinion can be of much value, except to persons of precisely the same tastes and temperamental peculiarities as the writer. But the higher aim of art criticism—which some distinguished critics are fond of saying is "only the narration of the adventures of one's soul among masterworks," while many cling to the old-fashioned idea that it ought to be the dogmatic expression of final, incontrovertible judgment—is surely not often missed in the contemporary "press notices" of theatrical proceedings. There are always discontented or malicious persons too ready to assert that newspaper dramatic criticism has yet other objects in view; such as the overpraise of one actor or manager to the detriment of others, or the subjection of æsthetic purpose to commercial expediency.

The fable is ever cherished by some unsuccessful actors and the disreputable hangers-on in the theatrical calling and journalism,—the thirsty and venomous horde of camp-followers,—that the business offices of the various journals exert an undue influence upon the critic in favor of theatres that advertise well. This may have been and may be still true of certain newspapers; and it is a fact that the "press agent" of theatres is permitted to wield too much influence in the field of journalism. But the "advance notices" and dubious yarns circulated by this too zealous officer, whose persistency and ingenuity are remarkable, cannot fairly be charged to the critic, who often has no responsibility at all beyond the writing of his own reviews in time for the press. As a matter of fact, the most striking faults of current theatrical criticism are, probably, undue severity of judgment, on the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one hand, and a too flippant view of serious effort on the other; and these are frequently attributable to a young writer's zeal and his ebullient spirits. Perhaps the publisher may be held accountable for the too generous supply of free announcements of theatrical plans which some of the "live" newspapers give to their readers. But every experienced journalist knows that the public appetite for stage gossip at the present day is insatiable; and the commercial spirit now seems to have conquered all fields, and to rule in the fine arts as well as in the theatre and in journalism. Personally I can testify that, in many years of experience as a reviewer of plays and acting, no publisher or editor has tried to influence in any way my individual expression of opinion; and I am convinced that jealousy and sheer malice prompt most of the charges against critics that relate to overpraise.

Similarly, the charges of bribery, of the evil influence of friendships between critics and actors, are most unlikely, and generally originate with men who have not a shred of reputation for honesty. The idea that some writers for the press largely increase their incomes by accepting payment for "puffing" various enterprises, artistic or otherwise, is occasionally fixed in the public mind by the revelation of the dishonesty of some fellow who calls himself a journalist and is popularly believed to be powerful in his calling, but who could not get employment to sweep the offices of a well-conducted newspaper. There are in New York and some other American cities, as in London and Paris, coteries of so-called journalists, to which not one gentleman of good standing in the editorial rooms of Printing House Square belongs, but who, nevertheless, have some power for evil. Stuff emanating from such sources frequently finds its way into print; but it bears no closer resemblance to the work of decent journalists than the cheap tricks of the shysters bear to honest and dignified legal practice.

A newspaper man must suffer always from his profession's lack of well-defined boundaries. Who can describe the qualifications of the modern journalist? A practical knowledge of bicycling, prize-fighting, or mountain-climbing, coupled with a supreme ignorance of the English language, may nowadays secure to a man lucrative employment on a newspaper. "Specialism" has been forced to its limit in that calling; and there is no longer a community of interests among journalists. And, even more than other writers for the press, the dramatic critic must keenly feel the lack of a clear understanding of the essentials of personal fitness in his particular branch. The professional critic of music is supposed to possess a sound technical knowledge of the art

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he writes of; to be able to score a composition for the orchestra, for instance, and to analyze a musical work in the manuscript. He frequently possesses, also, if unusually well-equipped for his task, good executive ability in music, and may be a pianist, a violinist, a singer, or all three. The critic of the fine arts who holds a recognized position in his field of duty must have important qualifications for his task other than mere sympathy with art. He is likely to be a fair draughtsman, at least, and to have a knowledge of the mixing of colors and the knack of modelling in clay. He is often a dabster at etching. Sometimes he has been a painter or sculptor; indeed, he may pursue both vocations—the artist's and the critic's—at once, although such a feat of double riding has its dangers and disadvantages. Still, there is no reason why a man should not pursue an art successfully as a craftsman and be at the same time a wise and just critic of the works of other followers of that art,—no reason, except that the combination in one mind of the judicial and creative faculties is not common.

But the qualifications of the dramatic critic are less easily defined. Actual experience on the stage is surely not required of him. He is not expected to know all the ins and outs of theatre management; while there is a standing complaint against a critic who is also a playwright, notwithstanding the fact that some of the ablest and fairest critics in France, England, and this country have been dramatists of distinction. That most of them who write plays are still enrolled in the great army of the unacted is due partly to the fact that the dramatist's task demands undivided attention; but perhaps more largely to the other fact, just noted, that inventive and analytical skill do not often go hand in hand. Some well-directed practice in the art of modern play-making will measurably improve a dramatic critic's understanding of other men's plays; and the spirit that would prevent him from nourishing his ambition to become a dramatist would also prevent any person who had written a book from serving as a literary reviewer.

The theatrical art of to-day partakes somewhat of the characteristics of all the sister arts; and it is undoubtedly desirable for a critic of the stage to have some sound knowledge of music and painting. But, while it is not uncommon to find among men of ordinary intelligence one who does not claim to be an authority on music or the fine arts, or even in certain branches of literature, one rarely meets a man who goes to the theatre at all who does not hold himself quite competent to pass final judgment on actors and dramatists who have devoted years of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor to their work. The ideal dramatic critic would be a man of the keenest sensibility, the clearest and broadest comprehension, and the most catholic taste; thoroughly trained for his task by the study of the literature and history of the stage; familiar enough with its mechanical limitations not to demand the impossible; a student of painting, sculpture, anatomy, dancing, boxing, and fencing, as well as of elocution and rhetoric; and, above all, capable of honestly appreciating the best in all forms of the drama and all varieties of acting,—free, that is to say, from settled prejudices and strong personal bias. But that ideal would be possible only in an ideal world. Sarcey, in Paris, and Archer, in London, with all their aptness and learning, would scarcely serve as leaders of thought in their calling, if so much were expected of the reviewers of plays and acting. That any large part of the dramatic criticism which now occupies so much space in the public prints, is written by men so well equipped, is doubtful: that much of it is composed in the spirit of the casual theatre-goer, who may pause before he commits himself to an opinion on a picture, or a book of poems, but is quick to praise or blame the actor or the play, is very likely.

It is commonly thought that the output of criticism is largely in excess of the visible supply of drama worthy of criticism; but this seems to be true now in all departments of literary and artistic endeavor, and, indeed, of our life in general. This is preëminently the age of criticism—constructive, destructive, dogmatic, and impressionist. The seeds from the old Quarterly Reviewers' gardens were scattered broadcast by the winds; and where one critic flourished in the good old days of trenchant analyses and hard and fast judgments, thousands have sprung up. All in all the press produces more criticism than anything else,—even tales of crime. Fiction in this era is no longer story-telling, but "a criticism of life"; and here, too, the supply exceeds the material on which it feeds; namely, manners. The increase of dramatic criticism is due, of course, to the large increase of daily newspapers; which is to be attributed to the growth of education (by which I mean merely the multiplication of people who know how to read), the cheapening of white paper, and the replacement of the old-fashioned editors with convictions by speculators in the purchase and sale of news and sensational equivalents for it. The number of theatres in this country has quadrupled in a quarter-century; and the theatre-goer of the antique world, who too had convictions, is almost as rare a bird as the conservative editor.

The typical playgoer of to-day cherishes no traditions, has no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well-established ideals, and is not, I fancy, easily susceptible to a dramatic illusion. We know that a large proportion of the playgoers in the era of few theatres and the concentration of dramatic art in large capitals were people who had inherited the taste for playgoing and imbibed a love for the stage, if not an understanding of its principles, in early youth. They might not have been, on the whole, more intelligent than the people who seem to predominate in theatrical audiences to-day; a large proportion of whom are descendants of men and women who never set foot in a playhouse, and who themselves had reached maturity long before the acquisition of sufficient money and leisure made them actually aware of the stage as a source of entertainment. It is curious to find these very persons most violently possessed of a critical or pseudo-critical spirit; to find them rarely willing to believe, when in the theatre, that they are listening to the talk and watching the actions of personages in a castle at Elsinore, the Forest of Arden, or a Virginia mansion used for army headquarters in the civil war. Before the drop has fairly fallen on an act one can hear them whispering loudly to each other their premature and ill-formed judgments of the play and the actors. This unsusceptibility to the illusion of a play must be peculiar to the bustling and confused age of transition in which we live; for I can trace nothing like it in those chapters of standard fiction relating to the drama, or even in the personal reminiscences of aged writers and artists. In these, to be sure, there are often passages of amiable criticism; but the fact is strongly impressed upon one that in the time of Kemble and Kean the finest and most thoughtful people felt the illusion of the acted play. They surely did so in later epochs; and in this country, until the social revolution after the civil war developed many thousands of new and unsophisticated supporters of the theatre, disorganized that ancient institution, and multiplied the number of daily newspapers. Now, perhaps, the influence of dramatic criticism causes so many persons to assume the critical attitude so destructive to the real enjoyment of the play. If that be true, there is one very serious evil to be charged to the dramatic critic's account.

In the old days, to speak only of New York city, the body of dramatic critics on the daily press was very small, and was made up of individuals who were supposed to possess superior artistic attainments, and especially to be rich in the personal qualities which make a man prominent within the mystic boundaries of Bohemia. Some of them were gentlemen of ripe cultivation and poetic feeling, gifted with eloquence, and pursuing their not very onerous tasks with rare enthusi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

asm; others were doubtless dissolute, dirty, and morally corrupt. Now, however, there is no Bohemia. New York has now no body of dramatic critics the members of which are even aware of one another's identity; while there are half a dozen daily newspapers where one formerly existed, each giving more space to theatrical incidents than used to be allowed, and each publishing weekly many columns of criticism of which it may be fairly said that if the best of it scarcely equals in literary nicety, exalted tone, and clearness of standards the best of the past age, the average of quality is certainly very good: much of it is sensible and interesting. It must be borne in mind that theatrical standards of taste have greatly changed. With a theatre which still esteems Shakespeare, but rejects all his contemporaries and nearly all his seventeenth- and eighteenth-century successors, as well as most of the playwrights of the first three-quarters of our own century; in which are contending side by side, Ibsen, the German realists and pessimists, the young English writers of social drama and intellectual farce, the unabashed manufacturers of machine-made melodrama and horse-play burletta, and the dramatist of newspaper jokes, it is not possible for either actor or critic to adhere to one unchanging point of view. The best the reviewer of plays can do is to record clearly the impression made by any performance upon his own mind; and this in itself is a hard task which requires good training and the possession of a mind as sensitive to quick impressions as the film of the camera. That, under the circumstances, the general quality of newspaper criticism of the stage is so fair and interesting, seems to me to be remarkable. In all newspapers of repute the "regulation notice," which used to be merely a fulsome, heavy, and ill-expressed puff of a sort now fallen into disuse except in very small cities, has been replaced by a vivacious and graphic account of the performance. Still, a doubt may fairly be entertained as to whether the immense mass of well-intentioned dramatic criticism is altogether beneficial either to the theatre or to the public. I am convinced, however, that nearly every newspaper, according to its kind, aims to provide for its readers the best reviews of plays it can obtain.

A dozen or more years ago, when the New Journalism was first planted in New York city, a young managing editor declared in my hearing that if he owned a newspaper he would employ no acknowledged critics at all. To the theatre, he said, he would assign men from the various editorial departments, according to the character of the entertainment, and would instruct them to record plainly their per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sonal opinions. To the music-halls, for example, he would send the office-boys. The young managing editor never owned a newspaper; and he is no longer a managing editor. His plan would not have worked well. When you have found a person who can receive a clear mental impression from any event or series of events, and can honestly record it in perspicuous English, you have found a critic of so great promise that it would be folly to employ him thereafter in menial duty. It is difficult enough to find men of decent education who can thus receive impressions and intelligently record them. The ordinary young reporter, no matter how quick he may be to accumulate facts and how handy in arranging them for print, will go to the theatre so overweighted by a sense of responsibility that he cannot enjoy the play at all; and he brings away from it only a determination to prove his wisdom by severity. The present aim of most newspaper editors in the appointment of dramatic critics seems to be to secure, above all things else, strong individuality. Still, these critics write with the tastes and understanding of their readers in view. One must not be invidious and use names; but can we imagine Jules Lemaître writing his subtle feuilletons for "Le Petit Journal," or Arthur Walkeley and Bernard Shaw contributing their weekly reviews of London plays to that solace of the cockney "sport," known familiarly as "The Pink 'un"? To say, therefore, as some folks do, that the aim and tone of current dramatic criticism should be higher and more serious, that it should exhibit a deeper perspective of learning, and sound a clearer, sweeter note of artistic sympathy, is simply equivalent to saying that the general public ought to be more serious, more refined, and fonder of art for art's sake. With the theatrical reviewers of perhaps half a dozen New York journals striving to preserve a high standard of judgment, and cherishing lofty ideals, it seems to me that the supply of serious dramatic criticism is rather more than enough to meet the public demands; and to ask newspaper owners to do more than that is to expect of them supernatural virtues and an abandonment of commercial sense.

Many of the incidents of any theatrical season to which the professional reviewer is obliged to give his attention, and out of which he has to make interesting "copy," have small claims to serious artistic consideration. The stage is largely occupied by frivolity; and most of the utterances that proceed from it are merely chatter. Yet, with all this nonsense and rubbish, which, to say the truth, counts for as much labor in the critic's routine as the noblest endeavors of fine actors, we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

still have the best the modern stage offers. No European actor of distinction fails to visit us early and often. We get all the worthy, and most of the unworthy, plays of all countries,—all that we want, all that the multitude would not be sure to reject. Probably the foreign artists find that their efforts receive here a fair share of critical consideration as thoughtful and able as they have been accustomed to at home; yet they must be keenly aware that the humorist is ever present when they act, and always ready to subject them to ridicule. It is not the custom in this country to view any subject seriously for a long time; and the greater the praise an actor receives the greater will be the ridicule he must eventually submit to. With the actors, after all, it is notoriety that counts. Praise is always welcome; but without publicity they cannot live. Moreover, dramatic criticism is not written for the actors; and few of them heed the best of it, though they may recognize the good intention of the critic. After all, the best criticism is only one man's opinion of another man's work; and an actor who has developed his powers of observation and expression by patient labor is not often inclined to change any detail of his work because some other man objects to it. So, also, with the attitude of one honest critic toward all his fellows. He lends all his mind and all his strength to his task; and if his conclusions do not agree with those of some of the others, it is not wise for him, perhaps, to hold that the others are wrong, though it would be human for him to do so.

The discrepancies of opinion frequently noticed in the mass of criticism are not more striking than the contradictions the reader of newspapers will find if he glances over the several editorial pages every day. Yet one of the gravest charges against dramatic criticism is that the writers do not agree; as if it were likely that men of so widely differing tastes, convictions, and training could be unanimous on any subject. Newspaper critics being such an inharmonious body, it is surprising, rather, how often there is an approach to general agreement. Perhaps in the twentieth century we shall have an ideal theatre and an ideal press, and with them the advent of a new race of ideal critics, each of whom shall combine the eloquence of Shakespeare's self with the virtues of a saint and the infallibility of the Pope.

Meanwhile, the dramatic critic is little more than human; and his lot is not so desirable that I should advise young men to aspire to his calling, or rather to his particular branch of a calling which contains no sinecures and offers few prizes. His hours are long and irregular; his work is hard; and he is continually at war with his own moods,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which must not be permitted to obscure his judgment. Necessarily a man of some strength of individuality, he must night after night subject his will to that of others and keep his mind in a perfectly plastic condition; and, if he gains any sort of distinction in his labors, he will find that the theatre pursues him wherever he may go in his rare hours of leisure. He soon learns the common desire of his fellow creatures to talk about actors, to the exclusion of every other topic. His authority, of which he makes no boast at all, is both proclaimed and denied; for, though he is likely to be transformed into a sort of minor and inferior lion,—a cub perhaps,—yet he never by any chance meets a human being who does not feel perfectly competent to speak the last word of judgment on any play or actor.

Still, if he have enough philosophy, he may console himself with the thought that he labors in a good cause, and that even if, in his efforts to make better understood a form of art that can never die, he has somewhat overstepped himself and helped to develop a race of imitation critics rather than a multitude of frankly receptive and highly appreciative spectators, that evil will in time be remedied. The theatre will grow in strength, in seriousness and in influence; and more good will come out of it in the future than ever came in the past. Now it is too much of a toy,—just as the phonograph and kinetoscope are toys,—because it has not been perfected. Modern development has affected it, thus far, only to the extent of bringing it nearer to the public. It is at the mercy of half-educated and tolerably well-to-do people, who are no longer satisfied with the few simple diversions of their fathers, who have found the cheap newspaper a substitute for the lecture, and who have been bred above dog-fighting, and yet are not capable of appreciating the best the drama affords.

The dramatic critic's work is more useful than ever; and no modest craftsman can ask for better encouragement than the knowledge that he is needed. As a medium for the expression of his views of life in general, he finds theatrical reviewing an especially congenial exercise. The drama is comprehensive and ever expanding; and to write about it day by day ought to be inspiring work for a man burdened with a "message."

EDWARD A. DITHMAR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE IMPERIALIZATION OF GERMANY.

THE Holy Roman empire, of which, from the coronation of Charles the Great by Pope Leo III, in A.D. 800, the princes of Germany claimed the sovereignty, and which hence was frequently called the German empire, came to a formal end in 1806. Sixty-four years later arose the new German empire. Though the two institutions are historically connected, in the sense that, but for the one, the other would not have been, and though they have some elements in common, they, nevertheless, rest upon different foundations and—ostensibly at least—aim at different objects.

The old empire, claiming to be at once the heir to Roman imperialism and the bearer of divinely derived authority, communicated through God's earthly vicegerent, occupied a unique position. Though it confined its action to man's earthly life, yet, since it regarded this as a mere preparation for his eternal life, it allowed itself to be guided by the exigencies of the latter. In other words, it became a means to an end lying beyond itself; and, as the realization of this end was the special function of the Church, it naturally assumed a position of subordination to that institution, becoming its "advocate," and the executor of its mandates. As such, it claimed the right not only to regulate men's outward conduct, but also, since eternal salvation was conceived to depend upon the beliefs and thoughts of the heart, to determine and control those by its own special weapons—law and force. Though this theory of the empire was seldom lived up to, yet such *was* the theory accepted by both Pope and Emperor. As a matter of fact, the Emperor was far oftener the foe of the Pope than his agent; and, since his claim to universal jurisdiction was due to the authority communicated to him by the latter, it was natural enough that, when this was withdrawn, he should become in reality what he was often called, German Emperor, or Emperor of Germany. The last Emperor crowned in Rome was Frederick III (A.D. 1440). But, however circumscribed the Emperor's jurisdiction might become, and however incapable he might be of making his authority felt, the German people never forgot that to them had once been conceded the civil government of the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nay, even when the great body of them broke loose from the Roman Church, by which that concession had been made, they still delighted to think that, when Frederick Redbeard should issue from the Kyffhäuser, disrupted, suffering Germany would again become united and strong under the eagles of the empire. *Das heilige deutsche Reich* inspired many a poet and many a statesman who did not care to think of the source or meaning of the *Heiligkeit*. Thus it came to pass that, when the new empire came into existence, it was almost universally recognized and celebrated as the fulfilment of an ancient prophecy, a long-deferred hope.

And yet the new empire is in no sense a restoration of the old. It is not "holy" or "Roman"; it is not the agent of the Church, deriving its authority from the Pope or from God; it makes no claim to universality; it has no regard to any life beyond the present. On the contrary, it is secular, German, and anti-Roman; deriving its authority from the states composing it. It is, in fact, simply that form of national unity which, after the failure of several attempts at federation, recommended itself to the political leaders of Germany as most feasible under the circumstances, and as best suited to its grade of political culture. Under analogous circumstances the United States became a republic; the states of Italy, a kingdom.

But, though this is the declared theory of the new empire, as understood by its framers, whether princes or subjects, we need not be surprised if we find that, among a romantic people like the Germans, highly cultivated intellectually, but untrained in the use of political freedom, certain features of the old empire should cast their shadow over the new. As a matter of fact, the present unity of Germany is due not so much to a desire for liberty on the part of her people as to the dreams of her poets and the theories of her philosophers; the former inspired by the romance of the old empire, the latter by the course of history generally. Schiller, Arndt, and Uhland; Kant, Fichte, and Hegel are its true fathers. Under these circumstances, it is but natural that there should be a tendency, almost unconscious, to assimilate the new empire to the old; to substitute for the modern ideal of democratic self-government the mediæval one of government by the grace of God. And such, indeed, is the case, in a marked degree.

This tendency is favored by a large number of circumstances of different sorts. The most obvious of these may be thus enumerated:—

First,—The great body of the German people have no aspiration after political liberty, no desire for self-government. The very patriotic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rector of one of the chief German universities said to me not long ago, "Die Deutschen wollen regiert sein" (The Germans want to be governed), and added that they were longing to feel again the strong hand of Bismarck over them. The truth is, the ordinary German cares as little for politics as the ordinary Anglo-Saxon, English or American, cares for art. His family, his business, his beer, his music—these are the things that occupy him; and he resents being called away from his easy-going devotion to them by any interests of a higher order, whether political or religious. While admitting the existence of these, he is glad to be relieved of the burden of them, even at the expense of a considerable amount of liberty. Instead of the Frenchman's fiery, spasmodic enthusiasm for freedom, or the Anglo-Saxon's calmer devotion to it, he has a fervent loyalty toward his political superiors, which, in large degree, prevents him from feeling his unfreedom. The notion that he should take any initiative in political matters, draw other people over to his opinions, and form a party for political reform, hardly ever dawns upon him. If parties of this sort exist in Germany, they are all, or nearly all, due to the Jews. The present socialistic movement, in so far as it is more than a mere theory, is altogether of Jewish origin.

Second,—The princes of Germany, accustomed during the long dissolution of the empire and afterward to irresponsible dealing with their subjects, have retained a certain brutal instinct of despotism, which makes them eager to relieve the mass of the people of the burden of self-government, and leave them to the easy, narrow life which they so much covet. This instinct has always been strong in the Hohenzollern family, and was particularly and obtrusively so in Frederick II, the founder of the greatness of Prussia, under whose auspices the new empire came into existence. That it should be tolerated in his successors, and especially in those in whom the long-desired unity of Germany is personified, is not surprising. Germany can never forget, and, indeed, ought not to forget, that she owes her present existence as a nation to the ruthless despotism of Frederick II. Thus the natural tendencies of people and princes play into each other's hands.

Third,—Germany at present needs a strong, united government; and this seems to be best realized in an Emperor of the mediæval type, of which the three Fredericks were memorable examples. The fact is, she is in a most perilous position, and has no salvation save in unity and strength. She is beset with foes within and foes without. She is divided against herself (*a*) politically, (*b*) religiously, (*c*) socially. Her

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

external enemies, (α) Austria, (β) France, (γ) Russia, are powerful and watchful. It will be well to dwell for a moment on each of these elements of weakness.

(a) The political tie which, in an hour of patriotic enthusiasm over a great victory, bound the numerous states of Germany into the unity of the empire, is in many parts very feeble; and it holds together many mutually repellent elements. Between the North and South Germans there exists that natural antipathy which always holds asunder peoples of widely different temperaments, ideals, and modes of life. In the case of Prussia this is aggravated by the fact that her parent, eponymous stock is not German at all, but Lithuanian. Then some of the larger states—Baden, Bavaria, Württemberg—hold an almost independent position, having their own armies, and could not be prevented from detaching themselves at any time, if they were so minded; while other states, like Schleswig-Holstein and Saxony, having been forced into closer union against their wills, can hardly be over-loyal. Altogether the empire is a congeries of loosely connected, largely heterogeneous, and unsympathetic elements.

(b) Germany acknowledges three religious professions: Protestant, Catholic, Jewish; and every child born in the country must be enrolled in one of these,[1] notwithstanding which regulation, a large portion of the German people, and these the most intelligent, belong to no profession at all. Between the different professions there is much jealousy and suspicion; while the Freethinkers despise them all. The Catholics are practically subjects of a foreign potentate, and accept orders from him even in political matters; while the Jews, almost universally unpopular, are persecuted in a thousand ways. Thus in Germany, religion, instead of binding men together and making them strong for good, divides them into mutually hostile classes, unbrothers and enfeebles them.

(c) That the interests of the different social classes in Germany—the land-owning, the capitalist, and the laboring—are at variance, is a matter of course; but, apart from this, there exists a social antagonism which has no parallel elsewhere,—an open warfare between economic individualism and socialism. Socialism, as a practical programme, is, as we have seen, of Hebrew origin: the theory of it, however, has a different source, which must now be considered.

[1] This absurd regulation is the cause of much ill feeling. The ablest and freëst thinker in Germany to-day told me that he would be obliged to have his son confirmed; else every civil and military career would practically be closed against him!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When the monarchic socialism, or feudalism, of the Middle Ages, with its supernatural sanctions, fell to pieces, it was succeeded by a crude individualism, which, being unconscious of its own implications, proved at first merely destructive. Toward the end of last century, its long pent-up forces found an outlet in the French Revolution, which began a new era in human history. But the dislocations and horrors which were its immediate consequences so frightened the ordinary, unintelligent world at the very name of individualism that, in the early part of this century, a great reaction took place in favor of strong institutions,—especially in France and Germany, which had suffered most. In France, among the more conservative classes, there arose a sentimental neo-Catholicism, which sought to call back the picturesque romance of the Middle Ages, without its stern piety, and to reinstate kings by the grace of God; while among those who had sat at the feet of Rousseau, Voltaire, and the Encyclopædists, and for whom the supernatural had no meaning, there sprang up various schemes of economic communism, all tending to bind the individual in the chains of a social order. In Protestant Germany the problem of reaction was more difficult. She could not well return to Catholicism, though some of her romantic sons did; and she was in no mood to barter her supernatural faith for dreams of communistic Utopias. Since Protestantism itself was the outcome of individualism, the problem took this form: How shall Protestantism be freed from its individualistic virus, and made to seem the highest expression of human reason—in other words, the absolute religion? Obviously, if this could be solved, a scheme, and one already in operation, would have been found for rendering individualism innocuous, by subordinating it to institutions unimpeachable, because absolutely rational. This solution was undertaken, on the basis of the then popular German idealism, by Hegel, who, after being an ardent individualist, became, as professor in Berlin, an equally ardent socialist (using the word in its original sense) or institutionalist. Assuming thought to be the absolute, and identifying that with his own thought, as well as with the process of the world, he first analyzed it into its simplest elements, and then proceeded to recombine these in such arbitrary fashion as to obtain the desired result. By a truly wonderful, because simple, process of thought-prestidigitation, by distortion of history, and by misinterpretation of dogma, he, of course, succeeded; proving not only Christianity to be the absolute religion, but, what was equally important, the Prussian military state to be the absolute form of civil govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment.[1] So great, indeed, was his success that his philosophy became almost official in Germany, haughtily extruding every other; and over his coffin a distinguished Berlin divine pronounced him the promised paraclete, and his philosophy the teaching of the Holy Ghost. In this way, Prussia settled down into a military despotism by the grace of a god, now identified with the reason or idea immanent in the process of history. Then, when she assumed the hegemony of the new empire, and her kings became emperors, the principles of the Prussian kingdom passed over to the German empire, which thus found itself in a condition in many ways forcibly recalling that of the old empire, with this difference: that the Emperor, instead of being the political agent of the Pope, now combined both offices in himself. But, when everything seemed most promising, the reaction came. It soon turned out that Hegel's game was one that other people could play at. Certain very able Jews, who had no reason to feel kindly toward either Christianity or Prussian rule, learnt it, and then played with counters of their own make. If Hegel had, as he said, adopted all the principles of the materialist Heraclitus into his own logic, Lassalle, the founder of German socialism, turned the tables by reading the whole process of Hegel's logic back into Heraclitus's materialism.[2] Thereupon two other Hebrews, Marx and Engels, taking the hint, substituted Matter for Thought in Hegel's process, and produced a system of materialism which found no place for either Christianity or military despotism. Assuming, as the mainspring of the historic process, the form of economic production, they showed, with a cogency quite equal to Hegel's, that the true and necessary outcome of this process was state socialism, their own political ideal.[3] Though Hegel, having maintained that every system of thought necessarily calls up its own negation, or opposite, could not logically have objected to this result, yet it was a very unwelcome one to both his school and the German government. The school, indeed, has completely vanished from Germany; but the government is left facing the trying dilemma, whether it shall continue to rest its claims on the grace of Hegel's obsolete god, or, embracing the materialistic reaction of the socialists, pose as the necessary outcome of the process of economic production—in other words, identify

[1] In all this, and in his attempt to decry the free institutions of England, there is no need to suppose that Hegel was more insincere than is any man who allows himself to be wafted along by the breeze of official popularity on the currents of his time. Not every man can be a martyr.

[2] See his "Die Philosophie Herakleitos des Dunklen von Ephesos," 1858.

[3] See ALESSANDRO CHAPPELLI, "Le Premesse filosofiche del Socialismo," 1897.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself with socialism. Bismarck even, for a time, apparently wavered between the two alternatives, and sought to take Lassalle into his confidence; but, later on, miscalculating the strength of the socialistic movement, resolved to persecute it. His persecution was worse than unavailing; and to-day, socialism, stronger than it ever was, faces the empire as a colossal danger that cannot be conjured away, compelling it to live armed to the teeth. Every one who knows Germany must feel that among the possibilities of her future is the capture of the empire by the socialists, and the consequent restoration of feudalism in a modern form. There are not wanting signs and concessions to show that, while the powers that be are opposing socialism with one hand, with the other they are making preparations for its peaceful triumph. Meanwhile socialism is a cause of division and weakness. If the internal relations of Germany—political, religious, and social—are such as to render necessary an almost despotic government, her external relations are no less so. Lying, without natural boundaries, in the heart of Europe, she is beset by enemies on every side. (α) Austria, however apparently friendly, can never forget her sudden defeat in 1866, or the remoter treachery of Frederick II; while (β) France, still smarting from her humiliation in 1870, is watching impatiently for her opportunity to take vengeance, crush the empire, and break it up into its component fragments; and (γ) Russia is ready to make common cause with her, as soon as she sees that such a course would be to her advantage.

All these circumstances,—the character of the people and the princes of Germany, her geographical position, her relations, internal and external,—and others might be added,—contribute to transform what was intended to be a confederation of free states under the hegemony of Prussia, *prima inter pares*, into something closely resembling the old empire, the memory of which has never ceased to exercise a strong fascination over the German people. The present Emperor is reported to have said publicly on one occasion, "Des Kaisers Wille ist das Gesetz" (The Emperor's will is law); and, if one may judge of his principles from his actions, there is every reason to believe that such is his conviction. When, moreover, we realize the position of his country, we can easily see why, desiring, as he certainly does, its highest good, he should wish to add to his power by surrounding himself with all the prestige and sacrosanctity of that which belonged to the mediæval emperors. At the same time, there is no reason why we should not admit that, in doing this, he resorts to methods which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be utterly intolerable to a free-spirited people. Among these may be mentioned: (1) his system of espionage; (2) his endeavor to control the Church and to gain political ends through it; (3) his attempt to interfere with the free expression of truth; (4) his exaltation of the military above the civil status. We may dwell on these for a moment, as facts incident to the imperialization of Germany.

(1) There is something specially degrading about espionage, especially when practised by a national government, as it is in Germany. This was brought very vividly before me by the following incident: One day there dined with me, in a public restaurant in Berlin, an aged clergyman and his wife. The former had occupied the same pulpit for over forty years, had proved a father to his parish, had been a leader in many liberal movements, and in all ways had served his country nobly; while the latter had for the same length of time been a very great blessing to her neighborhood for many leagues around. In the course of conversation I asked him how he felt about the Emperor's policy. Before replying to me, he turned and looked anxiously about him in all directions, and then said: "If Fritz had lived ten years longer, things would have been different." When I asked, "Were you looking about for anything?" he said, "No; but one never knows who may be listening; and it would go hard with me if it were known that I expressed such opinions." To my surprise, I then learned that Berlin was full of spies of all sorts, ready to catch, and report to the authorities, the slightest word reflecting unfavorably upon the Emperor, his family, or his actions; and that on such reports many persons, especially young men, had been seized by the police and kept in prison for months—one, because, in the heat of discussion, he had said the Emperor was a *Schafskopf!* When I asked my guests what they thought of such a system, they looked mysterious and declined to reply. I afterward spoke of the matter to several persons, who, whether from fear or conviction I cannot tell, informed me that they thought it quite right that the Emperor, his family, and actions should be above criticism, and that he should enforce this rule. I learned also afterwards that the president of the Berlin Ethical Society, a man of eminent scientific attainments, had been imprisoned for three months for venturing, in a public address, to express views on socialism different from those of the Emperor, although he did so without naming him. I could not help feeling that the Germans were paying dearly for their empire.

(2) Theoretically, the King of Prussia is head of the *Landeskirche;*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the Hohenzollerns have generally taken this office quite seriously, one of them having even compiled a prayer-book. No one, however, ever assumed the attitude of the present King, who, as Emperor, logically wishes also to be Pope. He has not only built churches and made church-going fashionable (it is four times as great in Berlin now as it was before his accession), but is erecting a national cathedral, as his own St. Peter's; and he undertakes to guide the councils, and regulate the creed, of the Church. When I was in Berlin in 1894, a church synod was in session. At a previous meeting, a committee had been appointed to draw up a new prayer-book, the old one having been found meagre and, in parts, antiquated. This committee had reported; and the discussion of their report was the chief business of the later meeting. I was present in a club when a leading member of the synod, a professor of divinity, gave a most lucid account of this discussion. The committee, he said, had presented a new prayer-book far richer than the old, and taking full account of the recent "Higher Criticism." It even omitted from the confirmation and ordination services the Apostles' Creed, as containing articles no longer believable. "No one," said the speaker, "can now believe in the virgin-birth of Jesus; and there are in the New Testament traces of an older belief. No one can believe in the descent into hell; while, as to the communion of saints, no one knows what it means." An overwhelming majority of the synod had, accordingly, declared in favor of the omission, and it was about to be carried, when a message was received from the Emperor saying that he desired complete unanimity. This was sufficient; but, as neither party would give way, nothing remained but to patch up a compromise satisfactory to neither. It was, accordingly, agreed that the Creed should be retained, but that it should be prefaced by a note, saying that only its general spirit was to be insisted on, not belief in its separate articles. Hereupon the Emperor telegraphed to the synod a message of congratulation. "His desire," said the speaker, "was to show the Catholics that Protestants could reach uniformity of dogma, as well as they." The audience received this explanation with strong marks of disapproval.

A few days afterward I asked one of the profoundest thinkers in Germany what he thought the result of this compromise would be. He answered, "A boundless and bottomless hypocrisy"; adding that the Emperor, unable to bring about agreement among political parties, and rule through them, was trying to bring the Church to unity of faith and to rule through it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(3) That, in his capacity of Pope, the Emperor should seek to control thought and the expression of truth, is but natural. Indeed, through his system of espionage, he has already taken the first steps toward the establishment of an Inquisition. We have already alluded to the punishment of Dr. Förster for political heterodoxy. A Berlin professor of divinity, a man of vast learning, liberal views, and noble character, told me that even the old Emperor, if he had not dreaded public opinion, would gladly have deprived him of his chair, and that, if he were to deliver one of his university lectures before a mixed audience in Berlin to-day, he would be denounced to-morrow and deposed next day. "The present Emperor," he added, "would gladly depose Prof. Harnack, were it not for his great popularity."[1] Harnack's offence is that he has shown the true nature and historic origin of the Apostles' Creed. These examples are typical and need no comment.

(4) Along with the Church, the Emperor has taken the army under his special protection, and has done everything in his power to exalt its officers. The lowest of these, he says, takes precedence of the highest civil official,—such, at least, is the report. Be this as it may, it is certain that German army officers find it possible to treat civilians with a contempt and a brutality which show them to be a favored class. Examples of this could easily be cited, if space permitted.

Surveying the above facts, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that the present ruler of Germany is seeking to restore the old empire, —with this difference, that he tries to combine in himself the offices of Emperor and Pope. His desire seems to be to govern his subjects as absolute sovereign,—their bodies through the army, their souls through the Church. If he should succeed in dominating, directing, and universalizing the socialistic movement, he might even restore feudalism in an aggravated form. The outlook is not a pleasant one; and yet it does not follow that the Emperor is either an unwise man or a bad sovereign. It may well be questioned whether, with any other policy than his, it would be possible to harmonize the discordant elements of Germany, and make her strong against foreign foes. "To be, or not to be, that is the question" for her; and she may well find it more advisable to bear those ills she has—including loss of liberty—than, by revolution, to fly to others that she knows not of. From this point of view,

[1] Two years ago, a government organ published a violent attack upon him. The day after its appearance, when the Professor entered his class-room, his whole class, which was a large one, rose to their feet in dead but ominous silence. He almost broke down.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is perhaps well that the Germans, being a learned rather than a cultured people (and learning is always confined to a small, select class), are willing to be ruled, and do not keenly feel the want of liberty. This is conclusively shown by their tendency toward socialism, which could be realized only under the form of an economic despotism.

No one can prophesy the future of Germany; but so much, at least, seems clear, that it will largely depend on the course pursued by the socialists. Three alternatives seem open to them: They may indefinitely continue their present opposition to the government, and then they can only be a source of weakness; or they may absorb the empire, transforming it into a feudal state, fatal to liberty and, therefore, unstable; or they may, in return for certain timely concessions, place their powerful organization at the service of the empire, and be its chief pillar of strength. This is the consummation that every friend of Germany and of humanity must devoutly wish. It would bring advantage to both sides and put an end to autocracy. The empire would have to abandon its attempt to return to mediæval military despotism, and allow its subjects large liberty of thought, speech, and action; while the socialists would have to abandon their notion of the state as a mere economic beehive, and accept it as the great institution for raising man above slavery to physical needs into spiritual freedom and culture. In this way Germany might be strong without being enslaved; and the present condition of things, against which all thoughtful men rebel, might come to an end.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TABLE NO. 2.

AVERAGES FOR INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS.

City.	School.	4th Year.					5th Year.					6th Year.					7th Year.					8th Year.					School Av., Column-Test.	School Av., Sentence-Test.	City.	School.
		Column-Test.	Sentence-Test.	Composition-Test.	Average Age.	Minutes Daily.	Column-Test.	Sentence-Test.	Composition-Test.	Average Age.	Minutes Daily.	Column-Test.	Sentence-Test.	Composition-Test.	Average Age.	Minutes Daily.	Column-Test.	Sentence-Test.	Composition-Test.	Average Age.	Minutes Daily.	Column-Test.	Sentence-Test.	Composition-Test.	Average Age.	Minutes Daily.				
1	A	66	67.6		12		81	79.6		12.8	45	79	77.2		13.9	20	90	76.7		14.8	25						80	77.1	1	A
1	B	67	61.8	96.8	11.2	50	80	72.6	97.4	12	50	90	77.7	98.8	13	50	87			13.7	40	94	82 86.1	99.6	15.2	20	83.6	75	1	B
1	C	71	71	96.7	11	45	77	81.8	98.4	12.8	35	88	71.5	98.2	13.6	40	88	78	98.7	14.7	30	93	85.8	99	15.2	30	83.4	77.6	1	C
7	A	B 33 A 41	77 68.6	95.9 97.5	10.4 11.2	30 40	49 55	73.6 79.4	97.8 98.3	11.4 12	20 15	67 68	64.2 73.4	97.8 98.6	12.1 12.9	20 40	79 84	73.1	99.4	14.1 13.6	40	84	84.9	99.4	14.9	30 35	64.5	75.2	7	A
7	B	B A 39	64.5 75.8	97 97.9	11.1	20	61 73	75 81.1		11.9 11.4	30 40	66 80	71.1 80		12.9 13.4	45 50	78 82	77.2 81.1		13.8 13.6	30 15	83	87.2 86.7	99.4 99.3	14.9	30	68.4	77.9	7	B
7	C	B A 36		97.5 97.4	11.2	35	57		97.6 98.6	12.4	15	65 81		97.8 99.1	12.8 13.4	35 45	79		98.7 99.2	13.4	30	83		99.4	14.6	15	65.6		7	C
9	A	B A 95.3	70.8 66.6		11.1	40		71.3 78				86	66.5 72.8		13.6	35	97	85.6		14.8	50						92.7	76.6	9	A
9	B	B A	66.4 68.4	96.1 96.8			88.5	74.8 76.8	97.6 97.9	12.3	45	82.5 83	73.2 75.1	98.7 98.4	14 13.7	35 45	86	86.5	99.4 99.2	15.6	60						85.7	77.7	9	B
9	C	B A 85	66 66.4		11.5	40		70 83.2				97 93	76.1 79.4		13.6 13.6	40 35	83	84.7		15.3	20						87.6	77.9	9	C
10	A	B A															78	80 79.5	99.2 98.6	15.4	20	80	83.5 82.5	99.2 99.1	15.6	20	70.2	76.2	10	A
10	B	B 45 A 50	61.4 75.9	96.6 98.3	10 11.5	35	70 75	76.6 77.2	98.6 98.9	12.2 13.1	20	75 71	72.7	99.2	13.1 14.1	20													10	B
11	A	B A 63	61.2 63.6		10.5	25		70.4 70.6				76 87	63.4 65.8		12 13.3	25	87 83	76		13.9 14.8	30	91	86.4		15.1	40	76.9	72	11	A
11	B	B A 53	76.4 79.8	96.3 97.9	11.5	35	69	74.6 81.8	97.9 98.5	12.2	25	80	74	98.5	13.8	30	81	80	98.8	14.2	40	90.5	86.7	99.1	14.8	40	74.7	79.4	11	B
12	A	B A	53.2 63.1					66.4 73					75 75.7					78.3					86.3 90.2					73.9	12	A
12	B	B A	53.3 67.2			18		74.4 79			18 10		73.1 78.4			9		90			12		90.3 94.6			12		79.0	12	B
15	B	B A						73 73.4	96.8 97.4				57 71.5	97.7 98.1				76.7 83.3	98.3 98.7				83.9 87.2	99 99.4				73.4	15	B
15	D	B A	74.3			20		81.6 83.6			20		68.3 72.7			20		74.7 84			20		86.2 88.6			20		78.8	15	D
15	E	B 53.6 A 59.6	66.2 70.8	97 96.6		15	70.4	74.4 79.4	97.8 98.3		20	75.2	72.8 69.6	98.5 98.1		20	86.4	80.6	98.7		20	87.6	89.4	99.2		20	75.2	77.3	15	E
15	H	B 49 A	67.2 69.1			20	66.2	76.2 79.1			25	71.8	69.8 76.2			25	85	81.4			25	90.6	89.9 89.4			25	72.5	77.9	15	H
16	A	B A 48	62.6 59.2	97.4 97.9	10.6	20	63	73.6 76.4	98.5 98.6	12.7	15	70	61.9 68.7	97.6 98.7	13.7	20	75	71.1 72.8	98.2 98.8	14.7	20	82	84 89.9	99.1 99.4	15.1	6	67.6	72.0	16	A
16	B	B A 36	68.4 65	97.9	11.5	20	67	70.6 74.4	98.5 98.2	11.9	20	68		98.1 97.7	13	15	78	71.3 75.3	98.5 99.3	13.5	10	79	81.2 80.2	98.9 99.2	15.3	5	65.6	72.7	16	B
19	A	B A 61	61.8		10.2	20	67	66.8 76.6		12.8	40	74	68.8 72		13.7	35	84	78 84		14.2		81	84.3		15.5		73.4	73.8	19	A
19	B	B A 63	57.4 68.4		11.8	40		73 78.2				76	61.3 69.5		14.7	30	83	69.5 84		15.9	30	87.5	85 86.8		15.8		74.7	73.3	19	B

Small B indicates first half, and small A second half, of school year.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED